DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 664 HE 021 632

AUTHOR	Berman, Paul; And Others
TITLE	Exploring Faculty Development in California Higher Education. Volume II, Findings. Report 88-19.
INSTITUTION	Berman, Weiler Associates, Berkeley, CA.
SPONS AGENCY	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	Dec 87
NOTE	160p.; For related documents, see HE 021 631-633.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-3985.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *College Faculty; College Instruction; *Community Colleges; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Needs Assessment; Professional Continuing Education; Program Costs; Released Time; Sabbatical Leaves; *State Colleges; *State Universities; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Participation; Travel
IDENTIFIERS	*California; California Community Colleges; California State University; University of California

ABSTRACT

The second volume of this three-part report presents the findings of a study of faculty development programs in the three segments of California public higher education: the University of California, California State University, and the California Community Colleges. This volume is comprised of the following sections: study background and purpose; definition and measurement of faculty development; faculty development at the University of California (programs, expenditures, and participation in instruction-related faculty development); faculty development at California State University (programs, expenditures, and participation in instruction-related faculty development); faculty development at the California Community Colleges (programs, expenditures, and participation in instruction-related faculty development); and perceived needs for faculty development (by faculty and administrators). Fifty-one tables are provided. Appendices provide additional information on programs at all three segments. (KM)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- ● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CA Postsecondary
Education Commission
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EXPLORING FACULTY DEVELOPMENT
IN
CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION

Prepared for the
California Postsecondary Education Commission

Volume II

FINDINGS

Paul Berman
Jo-Ann Intili
Daniel Weiler

December 1987

R-111/2

Berman, Weiler Associates
1149 Amador Avenue
Berkeley, California 94707

COMMISSION REPORT 88-19
PUBLISHED MARCH 1988

THIS is one in a series of consultants' reports on issues affecting faculty and staff development in California public education. These reports are brought to the California Postsecondary Education Commission for discussion rather than for action, and they represent the interpretation of the consultants rather than the formal position of the Commission as expressed in its adopted resolutions and reports.

A complete list of reports from the Commission's staff development project appears on the back cover under numbers 88-17 through 88-23.

Like other publications of the Commission, this report is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 88-19 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

PREFACE

This report presents the findings of a nine-month descriptive study of faculty development at all three segments of California public higher education. The study was performed for the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), as required by the 1986 Budget Act (Item 6420-011-001), which directed the Commission to coordinate a two-phased faculty development policy study in California public higher education. This is a report on Phase I of that study -- the descriptive phase. Phase II -- the development of policy recommendations -- is being conducted independently by CPEC. The study contract was awarded to Berman, Weiler Associates in February 1987, following a competitive bidding process.

Volume I of this report is an Executive Summary, which provides an overview of the study's findings and offers broad conclusions. Volume III is an Appendix that provides additional data and technical material, including a discussion of the study's research methodology, a sample of the questionnaire and survey forms, and material on statistical procedures.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was made possible in large part by the efforts of a great many campus- and system-level officials at each of California's three public higher education segments, and by the cooperation of thousands of individual faculty members.

System-level officials and faculty senate representatives provided invaluable and constructive advice during the preparation of study questionnaires and surveys. System-level administrators provided the data needed by the study in order to select faculty samples, and had direct responsibility for the reproduction and dissemination of all data collection instruments, follow-up with faculty to obtain the best possible response rates, and preparation of the data for computer analysis. System-level administrators and faculty senate representatives also provided very helpful critiques of earlier drafts of this report. Their major commitment of time and energy was essential to the study's success.

Campus administrators from each segment met with the study team to provide advice on the preparation of the campus-level survey instruments, and put in many hours of work with campus records in order to provide the data requested. They also bore major responsibilties on their campuses for coordinating the dissemination and collection of the faculty questionnaires, and for helping to insure adequate response rates.

Almost five thousand individual faculty members at the three segments took time from their extremely busy schedules to respond to the study questionnaires. The information they provided forms the core of the study, and, together with the information provided by campus and segment officials, has made it possible for the first time to construct a comprehensive overview of faculty development in California public higher education.

Particular thanks are due to Dr. William Haldeman of the CPEC staff, who with the help of Ms. Mary Sandy coordinated and directed the study for the Commission. Their wisdom, flexibility, and unfailing good humor made everyone's job vastly easier.

CONTENTS

Page

Preface i

Acknowledgements iii

Chapter

I. Study Background and Purpose 1

II. The Context of Faculty Development 5

III. Definition and Measurement of Faculty Development 11

1. Definition of Faculty Development 11
2. Measuring Development Programs and Faculty Participation 14
3. Measuring Expenditures for Faculty Development 17

IV. Faculty Development at the University of California 21

1. Faculty Development Programs in FY 1985-86 21
2. Expenditures for Instruction-Related Faculty Development 26
    A. Estimated System-Level Incremental Expenditures 26
    B. Expenditures Related to Off-Campus Faculty Development Activities 33
3. Participation in Instruction-Related Faculty Development 36

V. Faculty Development at California State University 47

1. Faculty Development Programs in FY 1985-86 47
2. Expenditures for Faculty Development 52
    A. Estimated System-Level Incremental Expenditures 52

CONTENTS (cont.)

Chapter — Page

B. Expenditures Related to Off-Campus Faculty Development Activities 56

3. Participation in Instruction-Related Faculty Development 63

VI. Faculty Development at the California Community Colleges 77

1. Faculty Development Programs in FY 1985-86 78
2. Expenditures for Faculty Development 82

A. Estimated System-Level Incremental Expenditures 82
B. Expenditures Related to Off-Campus Faculty Development Activities 86

3. Participation in Faculty Development 92

VII. Perceived Needs for Faculty Development 105

1. Faculty Perceptions of Needs 105
2. Needs as Perceived by Administrations 113

A. University of California 113
B. California State University 116
C. California Community Colleges 123

APPENDIX

A. Common Instruction-Related Faculty Development Programs and Activities at UC

B. Exemplary Programs at UC

C. Common Faculty Development Programs and Activities at CSU

D. Exemplary Programs at CSU

E. Common Faculty Development Programs and Activities at CCC

F. An Exemplary Program at CCC

8

List of Tables

Table Page

III.1 Categorization of Campus Services and Support for Faculty Development 16

IV.1 Reported Program Expenditures, UC 27

IV.2 Faculty Affirmative Action Expenditures, UC 29

IV.3 Programmatic Expenditures by Object, UC 31

IV.4 Programmatic Expenditures by Source, UC 32

IV.5 Estimated Off-Campus Faculty Development Activity, UC 34

IV.6 Estimated Expenditures for Off-Campus Activity by Source, UC 35

IV.7 Estimated Faculty Development Activity, UC 37

IV.8 Estimated Faculty Participation in Development, Specific Activities, UC 39

IV.9 Estimated Faculty Participation in Development, Overall Measures, UC 41

IV.10 Estimated Faculty-Time Spent on Development, UC 44

V.1.a Reported Program Expenditures from All Sources, CSU 53

V.1.b Average Expenditures Per Faculty Member, CSU Campuses 54

V.2 Programmatic Expenditures by Object, CSU 57

V.3 Programmatic Expenditures by Source, CSU 58

V.4 Estimated Off-Campus Faculty Development Activity, Instruction and Research-Related Activity, CSU 60

List of Tables (cont.)

Table		Page
V.5	Estimated Off-Campus Faculty Development Activity, Instruction-Related Activity Only, CSU	61
V.6	Estimated Expenditures for Off-Campus Activity by Source, CSU	63
V.7	Estimated Faculty Development Activity, CSU	64
V.8	Estimated Faculty Participation in Development, Specific Activities, CSU	66
V.9	Estimated Faculty Participation in Development, Overall Measures, CSU	68
V.10	Estimated Faculty-Time Spent on Development, CSU	70
V.11	Estimated Faculty-Time Spent on Research, CSU	71
V.12	Sources of Support for Faculty Time Spent on Research, CSU	73
V.13	Use of Released, Assigned, or Reimbursed Time, CSU	74
V.14	Estimated Instruction-Related Development, CSU	75
VI.1.a	Estimated Program Expenditures From All Sources, CCC	83
VI.1.b	Average Expenditures Per FTE Full-Time Faculty Member, CCC Responding Sample	85
VI.2	Estimated Programmatic Expenditures by Source, CCC	87
VI.3	Estimated Off-Campus Faculty Development Activity, Instruction and Research-Related Activity, CCC	88

List of Tables (cont.)

Table		Page
VI.4	Estimated Off-Campus Faculty Development Activity, Instruction-Related Activity Only, CCC	90
VI.5	Estimated Expenditures for Off-Campus Activity by Source, CCC	91
VI.6	Estimated Faculty Development Activity, CCC	93
VI.7	Estimated Faculty Participation in Development, Specific Activities, CCC	94
VI.8	Estimated Faculty Participation in Development, Overall Measures, CCC	96
VI.9	Estimated Faculty-Time Spent on Development, CCC	98
VI.10	Estimated Faculty-Time Spent on Research, CCC	99
VI.11	Sources of Support for Faculty Time Spent on Research, CCC	101
VI.12	Use of Released Time, CCC	102
VI.13	Estimated Instruction-Related Development, CCC	103
VII.1	Adequacy of Current Support for Faculty Development, Faculty Views	106
VII.2	How Faculty Development Emphasis Should be Changed, Faculty Views	108
VII.3	How Additional Funds Should be Allocated for Research, Teaching, or Curriculum, Faculty Views, CSU, CCC	110
VII.4	How Additional Funds Should be Allocated for Research Categories, Faculty Views, CSU, CCC	111

List of Tables (cont.)

Table		Page
VII.5	How Additional Funds Should be Allocated Across Funding Categories, Faculty Views	112
VII.6	Adequacy of Current Support for Faculty Development, Views of Campus Administrations, CSU	117
VII.7	How Faculty Development Emphasis Should be Changed, Views of Campus Administrations, CSU	119
VII.8	How Campus Administrators Would Allocate Additional Funds, CSU	120
VII.9	Adequacy of Current Support for Faculty Development, Estimated Views of Campus Administrations, CCC	125
VII.10	How Faculty Development Emphasis Should be Changed, Estimated Views of Campus Administrations, CCC	126
VII.11	How Campus Administrators Would Allocate Additional Funds, CCC Estimates	128

I. STUDY BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

Over the next decade, California's public higher education institutions will have to respond to rapid social, demographic and economic changes -- the introduction of new technologies, a shift to an information and service-based economy, and increased student diversity. In light of these trends -- and a sense in California and throughout the nation that the quality of undergraduate education needs improvement -- the University of California (UC), the California State University (CSU), and the California Community Colleges (CCC) have been reevaluating their instructional programs. Whatever changes in instruction, curriculum, or organization these higher education segments may decide to implement, many analysts are concerned that they will not be fully effective unless faculty receive adequate professional development services and support.[1]

The segments currently provide or support a variety of faculty development programs, but prior to this study it was not known how many or what types of programs are offered, nor the extent to which faculty actually participate in these programs or in other development activities. Moreover, even general estimates of the amount of funds spent on these programs and activities were not available.

---

[1] See, e.g., S.M. Clark and D.M. Lewis, eds., Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity: Critical Perspectives for Higher Education, New York: Teachers College Press, 1985; K.E. Eble and W.J. McKeachie, Improving Undergraduate Education Through Faculty Development: An Analysis of Effective Programs and Practices, San Francicso: Jossey-Bass, 1985; and J.H. Shuster and H.R. Bowen, "The Faculty at Risk," Change, September/October 1985, 13-21.

The California legislature felt that this information had to be acquired if sound public policy were to be made. The legislature therefore directed the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) to coordinate this study for that purpose.

Specifically, the study seeks to answer four broad research questions:

- What types of faculty development services, support programs, and activities were available to faculty in each segment?
- What were the expenditures for faculty development activities, and what are the sources for these expenditures?
- To what extent did faculty participate in campus-supported or other development activities?
- In the view of faculty and administrators, what development needs are not being adequately addressed?

These research issues are descriptive in nature, but they are extremely difficult to answer accurately. The sheer size and complexity of each segment, coupled with the relative autonomy of their campuses, creates great variation within and between segments. Research therefore had to be designed to collect data from many different types of faculty at many diverse campuses.[2]

---

[2] By agreement with CPEC and the segments, the scope of the research was restricted to studying full-time ladder-rank teaching faculty at UC, tenure-track faculty at CSU, and full-time teaching faculty at CCC. At UC, the medical schools were excluded from the study, with the exception of the University of California at San Francisco. For most study purposes, a sample of twenty-six colleges was included from CCC, in order to reduce the burden of administration. (For a small number of questions, asked of campus administrators, a survey was sent to all CCC campuses; details are

In light of a limited research budget and the complexity of data collection, answers to the broad questions posed above can be only approximate.

Approximate answers are sufficient, however, for the policy purposes at hand. The legislature is not seeking an evaluation of any particular program or an intensive accounting of expenditures. At present, too little is known for such precision. Instead, a broad map of the faculty development terrain is needed, in order to understand levels and types of activities, faculty participation, expenditures, and needs within each segment. This study provides this broad information.

The next chapter reviews the context for this study and the definition of faculty development, and introduces the range of programs and activities discussed by this report. Faculty development is not a new idea, and California is not alone in its concern to improve higher education. It is therefore important to

---

discussed in Chapter VI.) Programs or activities for non-teaching support or administrative staff were excluded from the study. Mail questionnaires designed for faculty at each of the segments were administered by campus representatives to samples of faculty according to a specified sampling procedure. Over 4500 faculty members responded to these questionnaires, representing all campuses at UC and CSU, and twenty-four community colleges plus nine CCC adult education centers. We also worked with campus representatives from the three segments to develop a survey about faculty development programs and expenditures; these surveys were completed by campus-level administrators at all UC and CSU campuses. For some survey questions, surveys were completed by thirteen of the twenty-six community colleges in the study sample. For others, surveys were completed by sixty-four of the 106 colleges. Finally, we visited fourteen campuses, and had telephone contact with virtually all UC and CSU campuses and approximately twenty community colleges.

place current issues in California in a broader national and historical perspective. Moreover, the characteristics of the segments and their various campuses, and the ways in which they are changing, form the background for any analysis of faculty development. These topics are discussed as an introduction to the study's descriptive materials.

Chapter III presents our definition of faculty development. It discusses simplifying assumptions that are necessary to measure the amorphous nature of faculty development and bring some quantitative clarity to expenditure estimates.

Chapters IV-VI summarize development programs and expenditures. They describe faculty participation in these programs and in other faculty development activities at the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges, respectively.

The seventh chapter is concerned with faculty development needs from the perspective of faculty and administrators at the three segments.

II. THE CONTEXT OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Recent pressures for reform in higher education throughout the country have highlighted the potential importance of faculty development. The nation's colleges and universities face growing demands for improvements in the quality of undergraduate education; at least a half-dozen national or regional commissions, study groups, associations or foundations have published reports since 1984 calling for major changes in higher education. In particular, the reports have recommended that four-year colleges and universities place a much higher priority on instructional quality when structuring faculty incentive and reward systems, and that the undergraduate curriculum be broadly revised and strengthened to integrate disciplinary knowledge, focus in depth on basic subject areas, and prepare students to think critically and continue learning beyond college. Most observers believe that such steps will require a serious investment in faculty development.

In some states, the legislature has provided extra funds earmarked for faculty development. Other states are considering such funding, or have promulgated principles or guidelines meant to stimulate their public colleges and universities to fund faculty development. For the most part, however, state legislatures and executive agencies have left the establishment and nurturing of faculty development programs to their higher education systems. Some statewide college or university systems have taken or are contemplating steps involving faculty development, but most activity remains at the decentralized level of institutions of higher education.

In California, demands for improving undergraduate education are also being heard. A 1986 University of California task force, for example, reported that "lower division [education] is something of a neglected child" at the University,[3] and a citizens' commission recently appointed to review the state's higher education master plan has charged that "the undergraduate curriculum . . . is frequently fragmented and incoherent [and] teaching is too often neglected."[4]

It will be hard for California's public institutions of higher education to respond to these concerns. Each segment is a very large and complex multi-organization with its own detailed rules, administrative procedures, and formal and informal operating structures. While it is beyond the scope of this study to discuss these complex organizations in any detail, an understanding of faculty development decisions at each segment will be enhanced if a few key points about segmental differences are borne in mind:

- UC is a constitutionally independent segment whose campus budget allocations are set by the regents and the Office of the President. The Office of the President also has significant discretionary funds from non-state and other sources that it allocates to campus and

---

[3] N.J. Smelser (Task Force Chair), Lower Division Education in the University of California, Berkeley: 1986.

[4] Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, The Master Plan Renewed, Sacramento: 1987.

University-wide activities. Campus chancellors in turn have considerable autonomy and discretion in allocating their budgets to instruction, instructional support or other purposes, including faculty development, though overall priorities are set by the University.

- CSU is a state agency funded by the legislature through (for the most part) line item appropriations that are allocated to the campuses according to a formula agreed to by the legislature and the Office of the Chancellor. The Office of the Chancellor has limited additional discretionary funds, mainly from the state, for allocation to campuses or University-wide purposes. Campus presidents have considerable autonomy in allocating their campus budgets for instruction or other purposes, but their practical discretionary flexibility is constrained by the imperatives of maintaining substantial instructional and instructional support budgets. Campus priorities set by the Office of the Chancellor are subject to the same constraints.

- CCC districts are funded directly by the legislature on a formula basis, and funding per student ADA is not equal across the system, due to district revenue differences that were "frozen" into post-Proposition 13 funding. The Office of the Chancellor has very limited additional discretionary funds (all from the state) that may be spent at the district, campus, or system levels. All decisions about faculty development (instruction, instructional support, etc.) are made at the district level. The Office of the Chancellor currently suggests broad goals for the system but has little power to set specific priorities for districts.

The 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education spelled out missions for the three segments that have helped to shape subsequent public perceptions and expectations. The University of California was designated as the primary segment for research, a responsibility that was to be co-equal with teaching. (The Master Plan was silent on whether research was to be UC's primary mission.) The California State University and College System was directed to make undergraduate instruction (and graduate instruction through the master's degree level) its primary mission, with research authorized to the extent that it was consistent with that mission. The California Community Colleges were charged with providing lower division instruction leading to student transfers to four-year institutions, together with vocational and technical training for students who did not pursue baccalaureate degrees.

Since these goals were articulated twenty-five years ago, the segments have had to respond to "economic and social conditions [that] have changed dramatically in ways that could not have been foreseen by the original planners."[5] Enrollments at the four-year segments have expanded steadily, but have fluctuated markedly at the community colleges, particularly over the last decade. Women, part-time, older, ethnic minority and immigrant students have been attending college in unprecedented numbers; many entering students have been poorly prepared for college work; the economy has shifted from an industrial to a service and information base; and there has been an explosion of new technical knowledge.

The current Master Plan review commission also noted that segmental responses to these changes have led them away from original master plan goals. At UC, "teaching has been subordinate to the research imperative."[6] CSU has increasingly emulated the research university model in its standards for faculty retention and promotion. CCC has placed relatively less emphasis on lower division academic instruction, as it has concentrated on expanding its programs for vocational/technical, older, and returning/continuing education students.

---

[5] Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, The Master Plan Renewed, Sacramento: 1987.

[6] *Ibid.*

These changes have at times been accompanied by a budget squeeze that has placed considerable pressure on institutional resources, and concerns have been voiced that concomitant strains on faculty energies, commitment, and enthusiasm have created a need for greatly expanded programs of faculty development. Each of the segments has implemented such programs, as this report details. However, all have been limited by resource constraints.

An analysis conducted by CPEC in 1985 noted that

> funding for current operations and capital outlay in higher education has been in flux for a decade and one-half [with] four distinct phases in the proportion of State General Fund and property tax revenues received by the three public segments: (1) a time of stability in the early 1970's; (2) an increasing proportion between 1974 and 1981; (3) a rapidly declining proportion during the State's fiscal crisis through 1983; and (4) a distinct reversal of this declining pattern starting in 1984-85, primarily because of increases granted to the University and the State University.[7]

Over this period (1974-75 to 1984-85), expenditures for instruction as a proportion of total expenditures remained essentially static at all three segments.

The budget cuts and uncertainties of the last decade have forced the segments to make hard decisions about how to allocate scarce resources. At many campuses, faculty development programs were sharply reduced in order to maintain instructional services and research programs. As discussed below, CSU continues to wrestle with limited funds for sabbatical leaves, faculty released time, and travel support. Faculty development programs at many community college campuses have only recently begun to re-emerge after severe cuts in the early and mid-1980s. And a number of UC campuses have considerably fewer discretionary dollars for faculty development than they would like.

---

[7] CPEC, Director's Report, March 1985.

* * *

This context of change, diversity and uncertainty forms the background for this study of faculty development in California's public institutions of higher education.

III. DEFINITION AND MEASUREMENT OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

1. Definition of Faculty Development

Scholars do not agree on a single best way to classify all activities that go under the names "faculty development", "professional development", "retraining", "renewal", "educational development", etc. Programs in this area often have multiple purposes, and discussions of faculty development frequently turn more on semantic than on substantive issues. The following broad classification embraces most types of development activities described in the literature:

1. Faculty Development, which includes --

    Increasing Knowledge --activities aimed at improving scholarship, enhancing research skills, contributing knowledge to a field, learning a new discipline, or keeping current in a disciplinary area. These are the traditional goals of faculty development, embracing such activities as scholarly research and publication, the presentation of professional papers, and similar efforts to develop and improve professional abilities.

    Improving Instruction -- activities aimed at improving teaching skills or skills in student assessment or advising, including understanding of student learning differences, course planning and organization, instructional methods, and use of technology in the classroom.

    Enhancing Personal Growth or Resolving Emotional Issues -- activities and programs that seek to insure continuing faculty motivation, energy, and productivity over the course of an academic career, including personal stress counseling, training in interpersonal skills, or career planning workshops.

2. Curriculum Development -- activities designed to improve curriculum, including the preparation of new learning materials, development of new disciplinary or interdisciplinary courses, and redesign of the structure, content, or pacing of existing courses.

3. Organizational Development -- activities designed to create effective organizational environments for teaching and learning, including training in team building, conflict management, or problem solving, or creation of a campus office to support faculty development.

This study focuses on faculty development per se, including curriculum or organizational development insofar as the latter activities contribute to faculty development.

The items listed above under faculty development are inclusive, encompassing virtually all aspects of academic life. Moreover, they are interrelated -- increasing knowledge affects instruction, teaching affects research, working on curriculum may improve research, and personal issues influence and are influenced by all other dimensions of faculty functions. Faculty development is truly a seamless web, and any attempt to separate individual dimensions is bound to introduce artificiality.

However, the policy issues underlying this study primarily concern improving undergraduate instruction. It is therefore reasonable to distinguish activities whose primary purpose is to enhance research from those aimed primarily at contributing to improved teaching. Granted that faculty development activities designed to enhance research may also contribute to teaching, and vice versa. But if policymakers are concerned with improving classroom instruction, they should be able to consider policy options involving activities expressly designed for that purpose.

This issue -- distinguishing instruction-related faculty development from research-related faculty development -- assumes major importance because California's public higher education segments differ in the relative emphases they place on research and teaching, as noted previously.

The dilemma is this: At the University of California, research and scholarly activity are considered normal faculty responsibilities as part of the University's mission. Activities supporting research or the maintenance of currency in academic disciplines are therefore not regarded as faculty development, which is defined at UC only in terms of efforts to improve instruction and curriculum.[8] This study's description of instruction-related faculty development at UC may therefore understate matters, because we will not describe what research-related support activities occur at UC, and how they might affect instruction-related faculty development.

At California State University and the California Community Colleges, services and support for conducting research and maintaining currency are considered legitimate assistance to faculty development, as are activities designed to improve instruction directly. The study describes both types of faculty development activity at these segments.

---

[8] In keeping with this definition, UC officials asked that the study's scope and data gathering at UC be limited to activities designed to improve instruction (including student assessment), advising, or curriculum.

More broadly speaking, any comparisons among the three segments must be treated with extreme caution. Segmental differences in missions, organization, traditions and budgeting are so great that the nature of faculty development and the ways that specific programs operate can have different meanings in one segment compared to the others. Accordingly, the study limits direct comparisons of findings about faculty development across segments, except insofar as comparisons are valid and serve the study's policy purposes.

2. Measuring Development Programs and Faculty Participation

What programs and activities should be counted as involving faculty development? This question is also not easy to answer in a way that would satisfy all points of view. The broadest answer -- and some faculty members and administrators emphatically hold this view -- is that virtually all activities (except for administration) in institutions of higher education contribute to faculty development. Therefore, any attempts to catalogue specifics miss the essence of development. Though this perspective has validity, our fieldwork uncovered only one campus where faculty development was so integral to academic life that the two could not be separated. We have elected to take a narrower approach. At each of the three segments, the campuses and the system offices provide services and support directed toward faculty development. This study describes these services and this support, as identified by campus reports of their faculty development programs and activities. (As discussed above, development programs and activities at UC are considered only to be instruction-related; at the other segments, research and instruction are both considered legitimate faculty development concerns.)

Although our study adopted a restricted definition for describing campus programs, it broadened this definition in order to identify the diverse range of activities that faculty consider as development. We did so because the reality of development activities for faculty may extend well beyond the formal programs available on their campuses. We asked faculty to tell us about their participation both in campus- and system-supported programs and in other activity. The study thus describes both campus and system faculty development efforts and faculty participation in the broader spectrum of development activities.

As far as campus and system efforts are concerned, we found that California's higher education institutions provide or support a wide range of faculty development programs and activities. The study's surveys and fieldwork collected information on more than sixty distinct development programs, which can be categorized into seven major groups of services or support to faculty, as shown in Table III.1.

The first part of Table III.1 lists categories of development services provided directly by institutions to their faculties. These services aim to improve faculty teaching, student assessment, and advising skills; help faculty with curriculum development, or the design or execution of research (or of creative

TABLE III.1

CATEGORIZATION OF CAMPUS SERVICES AND SUPPORT FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

I. SERVICES TO FACULTY

A. Information

- Direct presentation of information and ideas in workshops, etc.
- Publications
- Courses
- Dissemination of information on faculty development activities

B. Personal Assistance

- Peer assistance
- Specialist assistance
- Training or retraining
- Personal counseling
- Provision or repair of equipment

C. Research on How to Improve Faculty Development Services and Activities

D. Evaluations of Faculty Performance

II. SUPPORT OF FACULTY ACTIVITIES

A. Releasing Faculty From Teaching Duties

- Leaves
- Released time
- Adjusting the length of the academic year for purposes of faculty development

B. Funding Support

- Grants
- Cash awards
- Travel funding
- Payment of education costs
- Summer Salary increments
- Support for faculty exposure to new information
- Materials acquisition
- Support for collegial communication

C. Other Support

- Recognition
- Infrastructure and management support

projects in the arts); or help faculty stay current in a field or discipline. The second part of Table III.1 lists categories of support provided by institutions to their faculty to enable them to improve their teaching, advising and student assessment skills, develop curriculum, conduct research, or stay current in their fields. (See Volume III for a complete description.)

This catalogue of programs and activities can be misleading, however, as we shall show. Segments differ in the emphasis they place on faculty development, and campuses vary dramatically in the types of services and programs they provide and in the extent to which they support them. Moreover, the extent of faculty participation in these activities varies enormously -- and in some cases barely exists. In addition, faculty participate in less organized activities that can be also be called faculty development, as the following chapters reveal.

3. Measuring Expenditures for Faculty Development

Measuring expenditures for faculty development is also difficult. Consistent with the above discussion, the study focused on collecting data about expenditures for those programs and activities defined by the segments as faculty development (with UC faculty development once again limited to instruction-related activities). This simplification made data collection possible, but it did not resolve the issue. After thorough study and consultation with segmental and campus representatives, we reached an important conclusion: No complete and fully accurate account of all expenditures and costs for faculty development is currently possible -- at any segment.

The simplest explanation for this conclusion is also the most obvious -- there is no uniform accounting system for faculty development expenditures within segments or campuses, in part because there is no uniform definition of faculty development. In addition, there are also numerous other methodological and practical barriers to collecting complete and comparable data. (Volume III describes these barriers.)

Despite these problems, the study developed an approach that enables us to report information essential to state policymaking. This approach involved a combination of several methods. We convened a series of meetings with system-level officials and campus representatives from each segment to design a survey form for collecting expenditure and activity data across campuses in a comparable way. These surveys (which also asked campus administrations to state their needs for faculty development) were completed by campus administrators. In addition, we made field visits to a sample of sites, and telephoned many campus personnel to check on the validity, reliability and completeness of their answers. The information from the survey form was combined with data collected from our faculty questionnaire. By piecing together data from these various sources, we are able to present a coherent, albeit not exact, picture of expenditures for key faculty development programs at the segments (Volume III presents an overview of the study research design).

The study has focused on incremental expenditures -- monies used specifically for faculty development that could be committed to other uses or not spent at all. Data presented on the sources of revenue used for these expenditures reveals what fraction is paid for by state budget allocations and other state sources, and provides an estimate of the marginal cost to the state of supporting faculty development in higher education.

* * *

The next chapter describes faculty development programs and faculty activities at the University of California, and provides estimates of UC incremental expenditures for faculty development. Chapters V and VI present parallel findings for CSU and CCC.

IV. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

As noted previously, research and scholarly activity at UC are considered normal faculty responsibilities as part of the University's mission. University support of faculty research activities, or activities designed to maintain currency in academic disciplines, is not treated as a form of faculty development, and it was therefore agreed that descriptions of these activities would not be reported. This study describes only faculty development at UC designed to help faculty improve instructional skills, develop curriculum, or improve student assessment or advising skills.

1. Faculty Development Programs at UC

Appendix A describes the most common development programs and activities offered by UC campuses. University resources for faculty development in instruction and curriculum concentrated on the provision of specialist assistance (e.g., to critique teaching techniques); workshops, seminars, and related formats for presenting information; grant programs for projects to improve teaching; and equipment and material support (e.g., provision of audio-visual materials).

All these programs relied on the faculty to initiate steps to enhance their instructional or curriculum skills. UC faculty were neither routinely expected to participate in development activities, nor systematically provided with evaluations that might point to the need for improving instructional abilities. The only consistent form of such feedback was student evaluations of teaching, which though not always required, were the norm in most academic departments. They provided feedback to the instructor, but did not play a major role in most departments in evaluations for faculty tenure or promotion. Official UC policy emphasizes that effective teaching is an essential criterion for faculty appointment or advancement, including advancement to tenure. And six of the eight general campuses have standing committees of the Academic Senate dedicated to improving instruction.[9] At the same time, our fieldwork revealed that faculty continued to treat their career advancement prospects almost exclusively in terms of research productivity. In short, the reality was that most UC faculty did not view either their campuses or their departments as creating strong career incentives to improve instruction.

For FY 1985-86, little support was reported for instruction-related development through faculty leaves or released time, travel grants, summer salary increments, acquisition of equipment or materials, or faculty collegial communication. All of these activities were supported primarily as part of the University's research function.[10] Grants were available to support faculty travel in connection with training in new instructional techniques, assessment skills, or curriculum development, but the bulk of travel support was provided for attendance at discipline-oriented conferences. (UC faculty pointed out that at many of these conferences they did have opportunities to exchange information with colleagues about teaching practices, or attend occasional workshops on teaching or curriculum development.)

---

[9] The exceptions are UC San Diego and UC Riverside.

[10] Released time was rare because modest teaching loads were assigned to accommodate faculty research responsibilities. The University reports that from one-fourth to one-third of the

In like manner, summer salary increments, when available, generally supported summer teaching and research activities. Materials and equipment were usually acquired for research purposes, and faculty collegial communications were supported in order to help faculty stay current in their disciplines or exchange research information with colleagues at other institutions.

At many UC campuses, a number of instruction-related development services were offered by resource centers housed on campus (usually in offices not associated with other campus functions), and supported by funds available to the campuses for instructional support.

Some UC campuses made a point of encouraging a campus ethos and culture that included pride in teaching excellence. And some academic departments on every campus placed a strong emphasis on the quality of undergraduate instruction. For the motivated

---

departments permit a reduced course load for new assistant professors during their first year, to allow them additional time to prepare courses, and "a smaller number" reduce the number of courses for faculty who are engaged in major new course development or curriculum revision.

faculty member who wanted to improve his or her teaching skills (and worked in a department where teaching excellence was valued and supported), some faculty development services were available on most campuses to provide direct assistance or financial support. For other faculty -- and particularly for those most in need of such assistance -- faculty development services and programs were largely irrelevant. Moreover, some faculty would have liked to find ways to improve their teaching, but could not find the help they needed. In some cases, assistance was available but not adequately publicized; more often, it was simply not available. At both small and large campuses, we talked to faculty who wanted assistance and felt frustrated that it could not be obtained.

Moreover, a significant portion of the undergraduate teaching at the University was handled by non-ladder rank lecturers and graduate students. Many of these instructors were not eligible for the full range of faculty development services and support programs available to ladder rank faculty. We were repeatedly told that the quality of instruction of graduate student assistants was a matter of concern. Some departments required training for their graduate student teaching assistants, much of which was provided by senior faculty.

On balance, provision of faculty development services and support at UC was very mixed. At some campuses, service and support levels were low and there was little organized activity aimed at improving instruction, though informal efforts were made by some individual departments. Other campuses provided substantially higher levels of service and support, but gave little encouragement to their faculty to spend time trying to improve their instructional skills.[11] And whereas some campuses did encourage faculty to take pride in their teaching, and provided a range of opportunities for faculty development, demand for these services remained low because of the primacy of research productivity in determining faculty career success. Appendix B and Volume III present case study material on several exemplary programs at UC.

The resource centers were potentially effective mechanisms for coordinating, legitimating and delivering campus faculty development services and support, as they could bring special expertise to bear directly on faculty development issues. Some centers were exemplary, and appeared to be making some impact. At the same time, (1) centers were not available on all campuses; (2) the extent of their funding and administrative support varied from campus to campus and (3) they were greatly underutilized by faculty.

Resource center operations were demand driven -- faculty were under no compulsion to avail themselves of center services, and has few career incentives to do so. Demand for center services remained low, and the centers did not have the resources to act as coordinating mechanisms for campus instructional support services, which tended to be widely decentralized.

---

[11] Table IV.1, below, shows the wide range of reported campus program expenditures per faculty member.

2. Expenditures for Instruction-Related Faculty Development[12]

A. Estimated System-Level Incremental Expenditures

Table IV.1 shows the total FY 1985-86 expenditures reported by all UC campuses for all campus-sponsored or system-level faculty development programs.[13] These data indicate that:

> **UC reported a total of $7.7 million for faculty development programs that were instruction-related, or an average of $1103 per full-time teaching faculty member.**

This total excludes expenditures by schools or departments within campuses. Our fieldwork revealed that department heads and deans at UC often had discretionary funds that they could use for the support of faculty development, but it was infeasible for UC campus officials to collect reliable data on the expenditure of these subcampus funds.

---

[12] UC FY 1985-86 expenditures for research were approximately $766 million (23 percent of UC's budget for current operations), $139 million of which came from state general funds, with another $22 million from other state funds.

[13] Table IV.1 excludes faculty affirmative action programs for faculty development at UC, since these are the only UC faculty development programs that included research activities. This issue is discussed in more detail in the text.

TABLE IV.1

REPORTED PROGRAM EXPENDITURES
Instruction-Related Expenditures Only
UC*

Fiscal Year 1985-86 Expenditures	
Total $ (Millions)	7.7
Average $ Per Faculty Member	1103
High Campus $ Per Faculty Member	2747
Low Campus $ Per Faculty Member	266

---

[*] Excludes $1.2 million in expenditures for faculty affirmative action faculty development programs, most of which were for research (See Table IV.2).

Included in the estimates cited above are faculty development expenditures (beyond normal campus budget allocations) supported by resources from the University's system-level offices. UC's Office of the President did not offer any direct development services to faculty. It did directly fund as a Special Regents' Program block allocations to the campuses to use for instructional improvement purposes. At UC, these expenditures (excluding faculty affirmative action programs) totaled $1.1 million in FY 1985-86.[14] UC also expended funds for faculty affirmative action programs, some of which included faculty development activities. Table IV.2 shows estimated UC FY 1985-86 expenditures for faculty affirmative action faculty development, from the system level and for both system- and campus-levels.[15] One such program was the UC Faculty Career Development Program, part of which was funded directly by the Office of the President. The program is designed to enhance the career development of beginning ladder rank minority and women faculty, through provision of research support that will help them to complete work needed to obtain tenure.[16]

---

[14] Sabbatical leaves are not reported here for UC, where they are used almost exclusively for research and are funded by campus departments out of their instructional budgets. The Special Regents' Program is supported by the University Opportunity Fund, which comes from UC's share of indirect costs recovered on federal grants and contracts for faculty research.

[15] These expenditures are the only category of faculty development reported by UC that includes support for research.

[16] In 1986-87, an additional Pre-Tenure Award Program was created as an expansion of the Faculty Career Development Program, to provide concentrated periods of released time for junior minority and women faculty prior to tenure review. As of 1987-88, the program is funded at a level of $354,000 per year.

TABLE IV.2

FACULTY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EXPENDITURES
Instruction- and Research-Related Expenditures
UC

	Fiscal Year 1985-86 Expenditures (Millions of $)
System-Level Only	<0.8*
Total From System- and Campus Levels	1.2

---

* The UC Office of the President provided block grants to the campuses totaling $0.8 million, to be used for both faculty and staff affirmative action programs. These funds were apportioned at the discretion of the campuses between faculty and staff activities, and their use may change from year to year. Of the $0.8 million, $0.6 million was from state funds; $0.2 million from the University Opportunity Fund.

Incremental Program Expenditures by Object. Campus programmatic faculty development expenditures were used for salaries (e.g., of resource specialists); supplies and equipment (e.g., in support of workshops or conferences, or for a computer laboratory); for fees (e.g., to outside speakers); for travel (e.g., to off-campus conferences); and for various other purposes. Table IV.3 shows estimated overall incremental program expenditures by object for UC.

> **Salaries accounted for the largest fraction of expenditures for faculty development -- about sixty percent of the total.**

Sources of Funds for Programmatic Expenditures. The campuses obtained their faculty development funds from a variety of sources. Using data reported by the campuses, Table IV.4 shows that:

> **Almost seventy-five percent of UC's faculty development activities (as defined in this study) were supported by state funds (either from campus budgets or other state funding), including approximately seventeen percent from University-wide dollars earmarked for faculty development, largely from the UC Office of the President. (A small fraction of University-wide dollars were non-state University funds originating at the system or campus levels.)**

The balance of the funds came largely from federal and private sources.

TABLE IV.3

PROGRAMMATIC EXPENDITURES BY OBJECT
Instruction-Related Expenditures Only
UC*

Object	Fiscal Year 1985-86 Expenditures (Millions of $)	% of Total
Salaries and Benefits	4.6	60%
Supplies and Expenses, Including Fees to Consultants, Visiting Scholars, Outside Lecturers; and Travel	1.3	17%
Equipment	.5	6%
Other	1.3	17%
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	7.7	100%

---

* Excludes $1.2 million in expenditures for faculty affirmative action.

TABLE IV.4

PROGRAMMATIC EXPENDITURES BY SOURCE
Instruction-Related Expenditures Only
UC*

Source	Fiscal Year 1985-86 Expenditures (Millions of $)	% of Total
University-Wide Dollars Earmarked for Faculty Development**	1.3	17%
State-Funded Campus Budget and Other State Funding	4.4	57%
Other, Including Federal and Private Funding	2.0	26%
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	7.7	100%

---

[*] Excludes $1.2 million in expenditures for faculty affirmative action.

[**] Includes both state funds allocated from the office of the President, and non-state University funds (e.g., the University Opportunity Fund) allocated from the office of the President or created independently by each campus.

B. Expenditures Related to Off-Campus Faculty Development Activities

The incremental expenditures documented above account for funds that were allocated by the campuses or the UC system in FY 1985-86. But many other faculty development activities were not campus-sponsored or were paid for only in part by UC funds. Perhaps the primary area in which such expenditures occurred was in faculty attendance at off-campus courses, conferences, seminars, and similar activities. To estimate such expenditures, the study questionnaire asked faculty to report on their off-campus faculty development activities (e.g., conference, seminar, or workshop attendance; summer institutes, etc.) from March 31, 1986 - April 1, 1987. Table IV.5 shows these results for UC. On the basis of this information, we estimate that:

> **The average expenditure per participating faculty member for off-campus instruction-related faculty development at UC was $854.**

These expenditures did not come solely from UC funds. Table IV.6 shows estimates of the sources of support for UC off-campus development activity, based on faculty reports. The data show that:

> **According to UC faculty, personal funds were the largest single source of funds for off-campus activities. About thirty percent of such expenditures were reported as coming from personal funds.**
>
> **Department, school or campus funds were the next biggest source for off-campus expenditures, with about one-fourth of the costs coming from these sources.**
>
> **Federal grants or contracts and sponsoring organizations were also important contributors.**

These findings indicate that campus-sponsored development

TABLE IV.5

ESTIMATED OFF-CAMPUS FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY
Instruction-Related Activity Only
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
UC

% of Faculty Engaged in Off-Campus Instruction-Related Activity	21%
Average Number of Instruction-Related Activities Per Participating Faculty Member	2.1
Average Number of Days Per Participating Faculty Member Spent in Instruction-Related Off-Campus Activity	1.9
Average Total Cost Per Participating Faculty Member for Instruction-Related Off-Campus Activity*	$854
Total Cost for All Instruction-Related Off-Campus Activity (Millions)	$1.1

---

* Includes personal faculty funds

TABLE IV.6

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES FOR OFF-CAMPUS ACTIVITY BY SOURCE

Instruction-Related Expenditures Only
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
UC

Source	Expenditures ($thds)	% of Total
Federal Grant or Contract	$209	19%
State Grant or Contract	74	7%
Private Grant or Contract	89	8%
Department, School, College, or University	259	23%
Personal Funds	332	29%
Sponsoring Organization	143	13%
Other	12	1%
Not Reporting	7	--
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$1125	100%

programs represented only a portion of all instruction-related development activities at UC, and that system and campus estimates of expenditures for development understate the total expenditures from all sources.

Moreover, they also suggest that one must look beyond expenditures for formal campus development programs to understand the extent of instruction-related development at UC. It is essential to ask how many faculty participated in different types of campus programs or non-campus sponsored development activities. The next section describes the extent and type of faculty participation in instruction-related development at UC.

3. Participation in Instruction-Related Faculty Development

Table IV.7 provides a broad overview of the amount of faculty development activity at UC from March 31, 1986 - April 1, 1987. These data indicate that most faculty engaged in at least some type of faculty development activity.[17] Specifically:

---

[17] This table, and corresponding tables in Chapters V and VI, has in the title the word "estimated" to indicate that data from a sample is being used to estimate the figures shown in the table. This volume does not present any statistical information about the sampling errors associated with the estimates. See Volume III for a discussion of the sampling and statistical procedures used in the study.

TABLE IV.7

ESTIMATED FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Broad Measures, Instruction-Related Development Only
UC

% of Faculty Reporting Some Form of Faculty Development Activity	65%
Average Hours Per Year Per Participating Faculty Member Devoted to Faculty Development Activity	134
Average Hours Worked Per Week	60*
Average Proportion of Work Year Spent on Faculty Development if Faculty Work 44 Weeks Per Year**	.05

---

* According to a 1986 UC report, the average faculty work week is 60 hours. UC officials asked the study to omit from the faculty questionnaire a question asking respondents about their average work week.

** The number of weeks in a work year is an arbitrary assumption used only for the purpose of placing professional development hours into a year's context.

About two-thirds of UC faculty engaged in some form of development activity during the year.

The amount of time devoted to development was a small fraction of the faculty's overall work time during the year.

These findings suggest a paradoxical conclusion. On the one hand, there appears to have been a substantial amount of faculty participation devoted to improving instruction. But the relatively small proportion of time spent on these development activities indicates that the actual level of faculty involvement was quite modest.

This broad conclusion can be interpreted more fully by examining the data in detail. Table IV.8 lists major development activities, ranging from participation in campus sponsored programs specifically designed to improve instruction -- e.g., a videotaping service so that instructors might examine their teaching delivery -- to more informal private study activities (e.g., reading articles relevant to improving instruction) or conference attendance. This table provides estimates of the percentage of faculty who participated in the various activities. These data indicate that:

There was considerable variation in the rate of faculty participation according to the type of development activity.

Generally speaking, the lowest level of participation was for activities that depended on programs designed by campuses specifically for the purpose of faculty development.[18]

---

[18] E.g., videotaping one's own teaching, direct assistance from specialists, mentoring programs, attending summer institutes.

TABLE IV.8

ESTIMATED FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Specific Activities, Instruction-Related Development Only
UC

Type of Activity	Estimated % of Faculty Engaged in Faculty Development Activity
Videotaping of Own Teaching	6%
Observation of Peer's Classes	20%
Direct Assistance from Professional Development Specialists	7%
Mentoring Program as Mentor	5%
Mentoring Program as Mentored	1%
Studying Specialized Professional Development Materials (e.g., articles, training videos)	36%
Developing, Preparing and/or Teaching Experimental or New Courses and Curricula	33%
Attending On-Campus Course for Professional Development	6%
Attending Off-Campus Course for Professional Development	3%
Participating in On-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Prof. Devel.	14%
Participating in Off-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Prof. Devel.	19%
Attending Summer Institute	2%
Other	7%

The highest levels of faculty participation were in private study activities -- e.g., reading written material or preparing new courses -- followed by observing peers' classes and participating in conferences.

Faculty who participated in one activity tended also to engage in other activities. We therefore grouped these specific activities into broader categories to illuminate the findings discussed above, and to take into account the multiple use of development activities.

Table IV.9 lists the new categorization. We have arranged these categories in an order that suggests a crude scale of participation in faculty development activity. The least degree of active involvement (except for no participation) could be considered to be "only private study" activities (reading articles about teaching methods or developing curricula). Private study is a form of participation that some researchers would exclude from the definition of faculty development. A more active form of participation was represented by "conference attendance coupled with private-study." Still more active engagement involved direct participation in "programmatic activities", such as faculty mentoring, videotaping of one's class, or receiving assistance from faculty specialists. As discussed above, participation in these types of programs required that faculty take the initiative to seek out the faculty development services. The category that might represent the most active participation is "programmatic activity combined with attendance at conferences and private study". Faculty who engaged in many activities, including the

TABLE IV.9

ESTIMATED FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Overall Measures, Instruction-Related Development Only
UC

Type of Activity	Estimated % of Faculty Engaged in Faculty Development Activity
No Faculty Development Activity	35%
Only Engaged in Private-Study	18%
Only Attended Conferences, Seminars, etc. and/or Engaged in Private-Study	10%
Only Participated in Programmatic Activity	21%
Participated in Programmatic Activity *and* Conferences or Private Study	16%
	100%

more proactive programmatic activities, were likely to be the most motivated to work on faculty development.

Table IV.9 shows the results of regrouping the data from Table IV.8 according to the above categorization. Although not contradicting the results of the earlier table, this table reveals several new patterns, namely:

> **At UC, 35% of the faculty did not participate in any form of instruction-related faculty development.**
>
> **Somewhat under twenty percent of UC faculty participated _only_ in private study activities relevant to instructional improvement. Another ten percent had a somewhat higher level of involvement -- they attended conferences or seminars relevant to instruction-related development, and about half of these faculty also engaged in private study.**
>
> **About one-third of the UC faculty participated in at least one type of programmatic instruction-related development activity (and less than half of these faculty also attended conferences or engaged in private study).**

At the risk of over-simplification, it appears that UC faculty might be divided into three groups -- about one-third engaged in no instruction-related development, about one-third or more had a low to moderate level of participation, and probably less than one-third participated actively.

Participation for Different Subgroups of Faculty. The findings presented above refer to all faculty, or more precisely the average of all faculty. We suspect that some types of faculty participated more fully than others. The following findings indicate that an instructor's rank and gender influenced the extent of his or her participation in faculty development activities:

> **Generally speaking, there was more participation by females than males in instruction-related development activities.**
>
> **In particular, the gap between the genders was greatest for the highest level of participation -- programmatic activity combined with conferences and private-study. Women were more likely than men to engage in the maximum level of faculty development, and this was especially true for female assistant professors, who were most likely to engage in multiple development activities, including programs designed specifically for instructional improvement.**
>
> **Male full professors appeared to be the least likely to participate in any instruction-related development.**

The Amount of Time Devoted to Development. These findings provide information about how many faculty participated in what type of activity, but they do not address a companion question: How much time did participating faculty spend on different types of faculty development activities?

Table IV.10 presents estimates, based on faculty reports, of the average amount of time UC faculty spent on development activity from March 31, 1986 - April 1, 1987. The table shows that:

> **UC faculty who only attended conferences and studied privately -- a moderate level of participation -- averaged the most hours devoted to instruction-related development. The estimated average number of hours for this type of non-programmatic activity was about 230 hours per year, including both the academic year and the summer.**

In summary, it appears that UC faculty participation in development activities aimed specifically at improving instruction

TABLE IV.10

ESTIMATED FACULTY-TIME SPENT ON DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Overall Measures, Instruction-Related Development Only
UC

Type of Activity	Average Number of Hours Per Year of Faculty Development Activity for Participating Faculty
Only Engaged in Private-Study	131
Only Attended Conferences, Seminars, etc.	30
Only Attended Conferences and Private-Study	231
Only Participated in Programmatic Activity	114
Participated in Programmatic Activity *and* Conferences or Private-Study	173

was generally limited: A minority appear to have actively engaged in such development, but the amount of time they spent on these activities was not substantial. And the majority of the faculty reported spending a modest amount of time in self-directed study, or conference attendance, that was related to instructional improvement.

V. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

The primary mission of the California State University and College system is undergraduate and graduate instruction through the master's degree, with research authorized "to the extent that it is consistent with the primary function" of the University.[19] Many CSU faculty were anxious to pursue their research interests and to stay current in their fields, and at most campuses and in most departments, they also felt significant institutional pressure to do so. In the words of one recent campus administrative bulletin, "it is campus policy that evidence of professional development is and continues to be an important requirement for all faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure." Thus, CSU treats faculty development as programs or activities that support research, scholarship, and the maintenance of currency in academic disciplines, as well as curriculum development and the improvement of instructional, assessment, and advising skills.

1. Faculty Development Programs at CSU

CSU's reports of faculty development programs and activities were consistent with its broad interest in both research and teaching. Appendix C reviews the types of programs and activities that were common throughout the system, including direct services and support provided by the CSU Office of the Chancellor, using system funds allocated to all campuses or awarded on a competitive basis.

---

[19] California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 40050.

CSU development activities emphasized specialist assistance, the direct presentation of information, grants to faculty, released time, leaves, awards, travel funding, and payment (or part payment) of education costs.

CSU campuses provided other faculty development services and support as well -- but these activities were less commonly available and more scattered among the nineteen campuses. There was some provision of equipment and materials (for example, access to audio-visual equipment or computers), and some materials acquisition, usually through technical schools or departments (for example, engineering laboratory equipment, computer workstations). No CSU campus reported providing summer salary increments for research, curriculum development, or instructional improvement.

Support for faculty exposure to new information was not unusual, and often occurred in the form of faculty exchanges, visiting scholars, or faculty internships with industry. Some courses were also offered (for example, in computer applications). Faculty training or retraining was sometimes supported through assigned time and travel funding, but was generally not provided directly by the University. With only one important exception that we are aware of (discussed in detail in Appendix D and Volume III), there was no research conducted on how to improve faculty development services and activities, and little circulation of substantive publications; nor was there widespread support for faculty collegial communication.

Evaluations of faculty performance were influential in motivating faculty to improve the quality of their teaching or research. Peer and administrator evaluations of faculty research and scholarship often counted heavily in determining faculty retention, tenure, and promotion, and peer and student evaluations of teaching were also widely taken into account in faculty career step reviews. (On one campus, for example, department heads reviewed faculty teaching performance on an annual basis, including classroom observation, until faculty had reached the rank of Step 5 Full Professor -- the top step at CSU -- and three-person peer review committees conducted one to three classroom visits per year over the same period of time.)

At most campuses, the provision or administration of formal faculty development programs was the responsibility of faculty development administrators or coordinators -- usually a part-time assignment -- and/or a research or "sponsored projects" office that administered research grants funded by outside agencies, and helped faculty prepare grant proposals. Schools and departments provided a significant fraction of faculty development services and support, and some had set up small resource centers as part of this effort. A few campus-level resource centers had also been created to provide faculty development services and administer programs, but they were rarely staffed with full-time faculty development experts, and with one outstanding exception (described in Appendix D and Volume III) they did not offer a comprehensive approach to faculty development that targeted key problems with faculty skills, productivity or morale.

This review shows that the nineteen CSU campuses offered a wide variety of faculty development service and support programs -- but on the whole, the scope and depth of these programs were severely limited. Many faculty members had only limited access to faculty development services or funding, in part because campus resources were scarce, and were husbanded to support instruction. Travel funding, for example, was budgeted at an average of less than $200 per faculty member annually throughout the system, and state-supported released or assigned time was not funded through a separate faculty development budget; it was available only if normal campus workload requirements were otherwise met or exceeded. Consequently, reductions in course load were most often supported as "reimbursed time" -- funded by extramural sources. Sabbatical support -- a CSU budget line item funded directly by the state -- was available for about eight percent of eligible full-time faculty.

Access was also limited because of choices made by the system and the campuses. Discretionary resources were limited, but available, and could have been more widely used to support faculty development, as demonstrated by campuses that elected to do so.[20]

---

[20] Table V.1, below, shows the wide range of reported campus program expenditures per faculty member.

Faculty development programs were rarely tied directly to substantive assessments of faculty needs, or to evaluations of faculty performance. The programs therefore tended to be experienced by faculty as occasional and episodic rather than as part of a systematic or comprehensive program. While there was great variation within the CSU system, faculty on many campuses were directly involved in the planning of some development activities, such as campus-sponsored workshops. At other campuses, many faculty we talked to felt largely isolated from campus-wide decisions about faculty development programs (though this was less true at smaller campuses, and was not generally true of faculty relations to their schools and departments). They were often unaware of development opportunities, and felt they were under too much work pressure to become much more proactive in advancing their interests at the campus level.

On the whole, then, CSU faculty development programs suffered from serious resource and planning deficiencies, and often lacked sustained impact. Many faculty members recognized their need for more development, and had expended considerable effort and ingenuity to utilize what support was available, and to help themselves without support. Faculty motivation and demand at CSU were important strengths, and would be critical to the success of any new or expanded faculty development programs. Exemplary programs at CSU (discussed in detail in Appendix D and Volume III) utilized this faculty motivation to great advantage.

2. Expenditures for Faculty Development

A. Estimated System-Level Incremental Expenditures

Table V.1.a shows the FY 1985-86 expenditures reported by all CSU campuses for all faculty development activities. These data indicate that:

> **CSU reported a total of over $40 million from all sources in FY 1985-86 expenditures for faculty development, or an average of $3852 per full-time teaching faculty member. Of this total, $1337 per faculty member was for instruction-related faculty development.**

CSU also estimates having spent about half-again as much for research-related faculty development as for instructional improvement activities.[21] This estimate is consistent with the study's fieldwork finding that CSU placed a heavy emphasis on disciplinary research as one of the conditions for tenure and promotion.

Table V.1.b shows that there was great variation in reported expenditures among campuses. Although some of this variation may be attributable to differences among campuses in record keeping and in assumptions about the meaning of faculty development, there

---

[21] Three campuses reported spending more on instruction-related than research-related development; one campus reported about equal spending in these two areas; and eleven campuses reported spending considerably more on research-related development. Four campuses were unable to categorize significant fractions of their faculty development expenditures as either instruction- or research-related.

TABLE V.1.a

REPORTED PROGRAM EXPENDITURES FROM ALL SOURCES
Instruction- and Research-Related Expenditures
CSU*

Fiscal Year 1985-86 Expenditures	Instruc.	Resch. Only	Mixed**	Total
Total $ (Millions)	14.4	22.6	4.5	41.5
Average $ Per Faculty Member	1337	2096	419	3852

---

[*] Excludes $174,400 expended directly by the Office of the Chancellor for various summer institutes and workshops.

[**] Funds expended by campuses for faculty development, but not allocated in campus reports to research or to instruction, either because they were for mixed purposes or because campus records did not provide the data needed for such an estimate.

TABLE V.1.b

AVERAGE EXPENDITURES PER FACULTY MEMBER
Instruction- and Research-Related Expenditures
CSU Campuses, FY 1985-86*

1.	$ 350
2.	614
3.	1370
4.	1483
5.	1938
6.	2071
7.	2116
8.	2715
9.	3082
10.	3159
11.	3245
12.	3250
13.	3648
14.	3791
15.	3871
16.	4159
17.	7840
18.	8167
19.	10,031

---

* In order to protect the confidentiality of campus respondents, the number of faculty per campus is not shown. These data show no relationship between college size and reported expenditures per faculty member.

were significant actual differences in expenditures.[22] Included in the estimates cited above are faculty development expenditures (beyond normal campus budget allocations) supported by funds allocated through CSU's system-level office. These expenditures totaled $13.1 million from all sources. System-level expenditures included sabbatical funds of $7.1 million; $4.7 million in MPPP awards;[23] $1.1 million for other miscellaneous programs supported by the Office of the Chancellor and allocated to campuses either on a formula basis or through competitive grants; and $174,432 expended by the Office of the Chancellor for providing direct services in the form of summer institutes or system-wide conferences, attended by selected faculty from throughout the system.

CSU also expended funds for faculty affirmative action programs, some of which included faculty development activities. Estimated CSU FY 1985-86 expenditures for faculty affirmative action faculty development were $1.1 million, almost all of which ($.9 million) was provided by the Office of the Chancellor for two programs: (1) The Affirmative Action Faculty Development Program provided $760,000 for funding faculty leaves, mini-grants, and travel. The program is designed to help probationary or tenured minority and women faculty meet the qualifications for retention, tenure, or promotion. (2) The Affirmative Action Faculty Development Educational Equity Awards Program provided $160,000 in grants to 109 faculty for research or curriculum development designed to improve educational equity through teaching and curriculum that is more sensitive to minority issues.

---

[22] The campus-level survey asked campus administrators to distinguish between expenditures for faculty development services and support (Chapter III discusses the meaning of this distinction). Data reported by the campuses show that most services emphasized instruction-related development activities; most support programs funded research-related activities. Inspection of these data revealed that the campus allocations between these two categories may not have been reliable in a number of instances. Nevertheless, the overall pattern was clearly that most dollars were expended for support rather than for direct services to faculty. Of total expenditures of $41.5 million, the campuses reported spending some $37 million (about 90%) on support programs.

[23] Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise -- described in Appendix C.

Incremental Program Expenditures by Object. Campus programmatic faculty development expenditures were used for salaries, supplies and equipment, fees, travel and various other purposes. Table V.2 shows estimated overall incremental program expenditures by object for CSU in FY 1985-86.

> **Salaries accounted for the largest fraction of expenditures for faculty development -- about sixty percent of the total.**

Sources of Funds for Programmatic Expenditures. Using data reported by the campuses, Table V.3 shows that:

> **At CSU, less than fifty percent of faculty development program expenditures were supported by state funds, including 14 percent administered by the Office of the Chancellor. (Funds from the latter source were composed virtually entirely of state monies.)**

The balance of the funds came largely from federal and private sources (these figures include both instruction- and research-related development).

TABLE V.2

PROGRAMMATIC EXPENDITURES BY OBJECT
Instruction- and Research-Related Expenditures from All Sources
CSU

Object	Fiscal Year 1985-86 Expenditures (Millions of $)	% of Total
Salaries and Benefits	25.3	61%
Fees, Including Consultants and Visiting Scholars	.9	2%
Supplies and Equipment	9.0	22%
Travel and Per Diem	2.4	6%
Other	2.9	7%
Unallocated*	1.0	2%
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	41.5	100%

---

* Difference between total reported expenditures and sum of all reported campus expenditure allocations by object.

TABLE V.3

PROGRAMMATIC EXPENDITURES BY SOURCE
Instruction- and Research-Related Expenditures
CSU

Source	Fiscal Year 1985-86 Expenditures (Millions of $)	% of Total
Earmarked Allocations from the System Level	5.6	14%
State-Funded Campus Budget	14.7	35%
Non-State Campus Funds (e.g., Indirect Fees from Grants)	1.4	3%
State Agency Grants for Research or Other Faculty Development	3.3	8%
Other State Funding	.1	<1%
Federal	8.7	21%
Private Contracts or Grants	4.4	11%
Professional Organizations	.1	<1%
Other Sources	3.0	7%
Unallocated*	.2	1%
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	41.5	100%

---

* Difference between total reported expenditures and sum of all reported campus expenditure allocations by source.

68

B. Expenditures Related to Off-Campus Faculty Development Activities

Faculty Reports on Expenditures. As was the case at UC (see Chapter IV) the CSU faculty questionnaire asked faculty to report on their off-campus faculty development activities from March 31, 1986 - April 1, 1987. Table V.4 shows our estimates based on the information reported by CSU faculty. According to faculty reports:

> **Total expenditures at CSU for off-campus faculty development were almost $8 million.**
>
> **The average expenditure per CSU faculty member who participated in off-campus activities was $1258.**

These estimates include off-campus activities intended for either research or instructional purposes. We also asked faculty at CSU to indicate their main objectives (from a menu we provided) in pursuing specific off-campus activities. On the basis of their reports, we classified each off-campus activity into whether its main purpose was instruction or research. Using this information, we were able to make a broad estimate of the proportion of off-campus expenditures at CSU devoted to instruction-related faculty development. Table V.5 shows these results for CSU, where we estimate the average expenditure per faculty member for off-campus instruction-related faculty development to have been $617.

TABLE V.4

ESTIMATED OFF-CAMPUS FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY
Instruction- and Research-Related Activity
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
CSU

% of Faculty Engaged in Off-Campus Activity	79%
Average Number of Activities Per Participating Faculty Member	2.5
Average Number of Days Per Participating Faculty Member for All Off-Campus Activity	10.7
Average Total Cost Per Participating Faculty Member for All Off-Campus Activity*	$1258
Total Cost for All Off-Campus Activity (Millions)	$7.7

---

* Includes personal faculty funds

70

TABLE V.5

ESTIMATED OFF-CAMPUS FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY
Instruction-Related Activity Only
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
CSU

% of Faculty Engaged in Off-Campus Instruction-Related Activity	24%
Average Number of Instruction-Related Activities Per Participating Faculty Member	1.5
Average Number of Days Per Participating Faculty Member Spent in Instruction-Related Off-Campus Activity	5.8
Average Total Cost Per Participating Faculty Member for Instruction-Related Off-Campus Activity*	$617
Total Cost for All Instruction-Related Off-Campus Activity (Millions)	$1.5

---

* Includes personal faculty funds

Sources of Support for Off-Campus Activities. Table V.6 shows estimates of the sources of support for CSU off-campus development activity, based on faculty reports. The data show that:

> **According to CSU faculty, personal funds were the largest single source of funds for off-campus activities. About half the funding was personal.**
>
> **Department, school or campus funds were the next biggest source for off-campus expenditures, with about one-fourth of the costs coming from this source at all campuses.**
>
> **All other funding sources were relatively minor.**

3. Participation in Faculty Development

The preceding discussion described a wide array of campus programs, activities, services, and financial support for faculty development at California State University. This description tells only part of the story, however. A key question remains to be answered: How many faculty participated in these campus programs or in non-campus sponsored development activities?

Table V.7 provides an overview of the amount of faculty development activity at CSU from March 31, 1986 - April 1, 1987.

TABLE V.6

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES FOR OFF-CAMPUS ACTIVITY BY SOURCE
Instruction- and Research-Related Expenditures
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
CSU

	% of Total Expenditures		
Source	Research Related	Instruction Related	Sum*
Federal Grant or Contract	6%	1%	7%
State Grant or Contract	2%	0%	2%
Private Grant or Contract	4%	0%	4%
Department, School College, or University	22%	4%	26%
Personal Funds	43%	6%	49%
Sponsoring Organization	8%	1%	9%
Other	2%	0%	2%
Column Total	87%	12%	99%
TOTAL EXPENDITURES (in $thds)	$7463**		

---

* Due to rounding, does not add to 100%.

** Excludes respondents who did not indicate a main objective. Total for all respondents, including those who did not indicate a main objective, was $7561.

TABLE V.7

ESTIMATED FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Broad Measures, Instruction- and Research-Related Development
CSU

% of Faculty Reporting Some Form of Faculty Development Activity	95%
Average Hours Per Year Per Participating Faculty Member Devoted to Faculty Development Activity	259
Average Hours Worked Per Week*	49
Average Proportion of Work Year Spent on Faculty Development if Faculty Work 44 Weeks Per Year**	.12

---

* This estimate is based on faculty responses to a question in the faculty questionnaire.

** The number of weeks in a work year is an arbitrary assumption used only for the purpose of placing professional development hours into a year's context.

The table shows that almost all faculty engaged in at least some type of faculty development activity. Specifically:

> **About ninety-five percent of CSU faculty engaged in some form of development activity during the year.**
>
> **The amount of time devoted to development was about one-eighth of the faculty's overall work time during the year.**

Thus, faculty development at CSU in support of research and instruction was pervasive. At the same time, faculty spent a relatively small proportion of their time on these development activities, indicating a modest overall level of involvement. Table V.8 presents data that allows us to examine this finding in more detail. The table lists the major development activities, and provides estimates of the percentage of faculty at CSU who participated in the various activities, based on the responses of a sample of CSU faculty to the study questionnaire. These data indicate that:

> **There was considerable variation in the rate of CSU faculty participation according to the type of development activity.**
>
> **The lowest level of participation was for activities that depended on programs designed by campuses (or the system) specifically for the purpose of faculty development.[24]**
>
> **Faculty participation was highest for off-campus conference attendance (which for CSU faculty included attendance at professional and discipline-related conferences or meetings), followed by private study activities and participation in on-campus conferences.**

---

[24] See Chapter IV, Note 18.

TABLE V.8

ESTIMATED FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Specific Activities, Instruction- and Research-Related Development
CSU

Type of Activity	Estimated % of Faculty Engaged in Faculty Development Activity
Videotaping of Own Teaching	13%
Observation of Peer's Classes	18%
Direct Assistance from Professional Development Specialists	13%
Mentoring Program as Mentor	11%
Mentoring Program as Mentored	6%
Studying Specialized Professional Development Materials (e.g., articles, training videos)	51%
Developing, Preparing and/or Teaching Experimental or New Courses and Curricula	51%
Attending On-Campus Course for Professional Development	16%
Attending Off-Campus Course for Professional Development	19%
Participating in On-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Prof. Devel.	48%
Participating in Off-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Prof. Devel.	74%
Attending Summer Institute	7%
Other	17%

As with UC, we have grouped these specific activities into broader categories in order to take into account the multiple use of development activities.

Table V.9 lists the new categorization. Following the scheme discussed in the preceding chapter for Table IV.9, we have arranged these categories in an order that suggests a crude scale of participation in faculty development activity. The table shows that:

> **Almost all CSU faculty participated in some form of development, and about half engaged both in programs designed specifically for faculty development and in the more general activities of conference attendance or private study.**

It appears that about one in ten CSU faculty members had little or no involvement, perhaps four out of ten faculty participated moderately, and as many as half the faculty participated actively in instruction- or research-related development.

Participation for Different Subgroups of Faculty. The findings presented above refer to the average of all faculty. The following findings indicate that an instructor's rank and gender may have influenced the extent of his or her participation in faculty development activities:

> **A higher percentage of assistant professors compared to full professors engaged in developing new courses, participating in on- and off-campus conferences, receiving assistance from specialists, attending on- and off-campus courses, and being mentored.**
>
> **Above the rank of assistant professor, there was more participation by females than males in faculty development activities.**

TABLE V.9

ESTIMATED FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Overall Measures, Instruction- and Research-Related Development
CSU

Type of Activity	Estimated % of Faculty Engaged in Faculty Development Activity
No Faculty Development Activity	5%
Only Engaged in Private-Study	5%
Only Attended Conferences, Seminars, etc. and/or Engaged in Private-Study	31%
Only Participated in Programmatic Activity	8%
Participated in Programmatic Activity *and* Conferences or Private Study	51%
	100%

The gap between the genders was greatest for the highest level of participation -- programmatic activity combined with conferences and private-study. Male full professors were least likely to engage in the maximum level of faculty development.

The Amount of Time Devoted to Development. Table V.10 shows estimates of the average amount of time CSU faculty spent on development activities from March 31, 1986 - April 1, 1987, based on faculty reports. These data indicate that:

CSU faculty who participated in both programmatic and other activities -- which may be the highest level of participation -- averaged the most hours devoted to faculty development compared to other CSU faculty. This group of faculty constituted about half of the CSU faculty.

Clearly then, participation in faculty development at CSU was pervasive, but only half of the faculty achieved high levels of participation and extensive time devoted to faculty development.

Research and Faculty Development. The study asked CSU faculty to distinguish between the amount of time they devoted to research and the time devoted to other development activities. With this information, this section provides estimates of differences between instruction-related and research-related development at CSU.

Table V.11 shows various measures of faculty engagement in research at CSU, as reported by the faculty sample.

The vast majority of faculty at CSU (we estimate 79%) conducted research between August 15, 1986 and April 1, 1987.

TABLE V.10

ESTIMATED FACULTY-TIME SPENT ON DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Overall Measures, Instruction- and Research-Related Development
CSU

Type of Activity	Average Number of Hours Per Year of Faculty Development Activity for Participating Faculty
Only Engaged in Private-Study	202
Only Attended Conferences, Seminars, etc.	66
Only Attended Conferences and Private-Study	258
Only Participated in Programmatic Activity	224
Participated in Programmatic Activity and Conferences or Private-Study	317

TABLE V.11

ESTIMATED FACULTY-TIME SPENT ON RESEARCH
CSU

% of Faculty Who Conducted Research From August 15, 1986-April 1, 1987 or Summer 1986	79%
Average Hours Per Week Per Faculty Spent on Research by Faculty Who Conducted Research	
From August 15, 1986-April 1, 1987	13
During Summer 1986	22
Average Hours Per Week Per Faculty Spent on All Professional Duties (Including Research, Teaching, Advising, etc.) by All Faculty, March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987	
During Academic Year	49
During Summer 1986	29
Average Hours Per Week Per Faculty Spent on All Professional Duties (Including Research, Teaching, Advising, etc.) by Faculty Who Conducted Research, August 15, 1986-April 1, 1987	
During Academic Year	46
During Summer 1986	27
Proportion of Work Week Devoted to Research by Faculty Who Conducted Research, August 15, 1986-April 1, 1987	
During Academic Year	.28
During Summer 1986	.82

Faculty who conducted research spent less than thirty percent of their time on research during the academic year, and spent most of their work time during the summer on research.

Table V.12 shows the sources of support for research, as estimated from faculty reports. The results are quite striking:

Faculty who conducted research at CSU report that much of that research was not funded.

At CSU, funding from the campus or system was probably about equal to funding from outside sources.

Aside from funding for research, the faculty at CSU obtained released, assigned, or reimbursed time that lightened their teaching load for various development purposes, including research.[25] Table V.13 shows estimates of the extent of, and purpose for, released, assigned, or reimbursed time. Based on faculty reports, we estimate that:

About one-quarter of CSU faculty were released from at least one course in 1986-87.

This time was used primarily for research.

The evidence clearly shows that research purposes pervaded faculty development at CSU. The data in Table V.14 provide more precise information about this relationship. For each specific faculty development activity, the table shows estimates of the percentage of faculty who reported that research was their primary objective for engaging in that activity. The main findings are:

---

[25] CSU reports that the bulk of support for releasing faculty from teaching duties was from reimbursed time -- i.e., from non-state funds.

82

TABLE V.12

SOURCES OF SUPPORT FOR FACULTY TIME SPENT ON RESEARCH
CSU

Source of Support for Faculty Research Time	Average % of Support from Funding Source	
	Acad. Year	Summer
No Funding	60%	68%
Only Federal Grant or Contract	3%	4%
Only State Grant or Contract	1%	3%
Only Private Sector, Foundation Grant or Contract or Other	12%	13%
Only Campus or System Funding	16%	5%
More Than One Extramural Source	4%	5%
Campus or System Plus Other Sources	4%	2%
Total	100%	100%

TABLE V.13

USE OF RELEASED, ASSIGNED, OR REIMBURSED TIME
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
CSU

Estimated % of Faculty Who Had Released, Assigned or Reimbursed Time Between March 31, 1986 and April 1, 1987		27%
Estimated Proportion of Released, Assigned or Reimbursed Time Used for:		
Instructional Purposes Only		.13
Curriculum Purposes Only		.07
Curriculum and Instructional Only		.02
Research Only		.40
Research Plus Other Purposes		.09
Purpose Not Reported		.29
	Total	1.00

TABLE V.14

ESTIMATED INSTRUCTION-RELATED DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Specific Activities
CSU

Type of Activity	Estimated Percent of Faculty Who Engaged in Activity and Who had Instruction-Related Objectives as Primary Purpose for Engaging in Activity
Videotaping of Own Teaching	12%
Observation of Peer's Classes	13%
Direct Assist. from Specialists	07%
Mentoring Program as Mentor	07%
Mentoring Program as Mentored	03%
Studying Specialized Materials	18%
Developing New Curricula	38%
Attending On-Campus Course	10%
Attending Off-Campus Course	06%
Participating in On-Campus Conference	--*
Participating in Off-Campus Conference	--*
Attending Summer Institute	02%

---

* Since there are multiple conferences per faculty member encompassed under this category, we have not classified faculty on this variable.

> No development activity was exclusively used for research, though research purposes were cited by sizeable percentages of faculty even for activities usually identified as related to teaching.
>
> High percentages of faculty reported research as their primary objective in studying specialized materials, and in attending off-campus courses and summer institutes. Even programs that are usually thought of as geared toward instructional improvement -- namely, mentor programs and assistance from faculty development specialists -- were cited by almost half the faculty as having research as their primary objective.

In summary, these results confirm the impressions from our fieldwork -- conducting and disseminating research was a major concern among faculty at CSU. Though almost all faculty engaged in either research- or instruction-related development, research had the highest priority.

VI. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The California Community Colleges are teaching institutions, and their faculty development concerns are centered on the improvement of instruction and curriculum, and on ensuring that their faculty remain current in their fields. The latter concern is particularly salient for faculty who teach technical and vocational courses, which comprise approximately half of the community colleges' curriculum. Community college faculty did pursue disciplinary research and engage in other scholarly activities, in part as one means for remaining current in their fields. But they were under no pressure to conduct and publish research as a condition for retention, tenure and promotion, and disciplinary research was not a significant faculty development objective.[26]

Two campus surveys and a faculty questionnaire were sent to community colleges. Campus Survey I and the faculty questionnaire were similar to the campus and faculty instruments sent to CSU campuses, and were sent by the Office of the Chancellor to a sample of twenty-six community colleges. Faculty from twenty-four colleges (and nine adult education centers) responded to the faculty questionnaire; thirteen colleges completed Campus Survey I. In order to obtain more reliable estimates of college faculty development expenditures, and of campus administrations' views of faculty needs, Campus Survey II was subsequently sent to all the community colleges; it requested information restricted to the latter two categories. Sixty-four colleges responded to Campus Survey II; these colleges proved to be adequately representative of all the colleges on a number of key dimensions such as size and metropolitan status.[27]

---

[26] Research at the community colleges sometimes means "institutional research" -- studies of student retention, college governance, or some other aspect of the colleges as institutions.

The following discussion of faculty development programs is based on data from the thirteen colleges that responded to Campus Survey I, and on study fieldwork at five campuses and telephone contact with some twenty campuses, but is limited by this low survey response rate. Later sections on CCC expenditures and needs are based on responses from sixty-four colleges to Campus Survey II, and on faculty questionnaire data.

1. Faculty Development Programs in FY 1985-86

Appendix E lists the types of faculty development programs that were most common at CCC, including system-wide support programs. During FY 1985-86, the community colleges concentrated on the direct presentation of information (particularly workshops and lectures), leaves (mostly sabbaticals), travel funding, and specialist assistance (much of it for help with computers, media, and grant proposal preparation). Campuses also supported the provision of courses by faculty for their colleagues, provided released time and grants to faculty, occasionally arranged programs of peer assistance, and provided payment of education costs for faculty who took off-campus courses. They supported faculty exposure to new information (mainly faculty exchanges), as well as faculty collegial communication. And some colleges participated in a state program that allows any community college to reduce the length of its academic year by up to fifteen days if this time is used for faculty development.

---

[27] See Volume III for details.

With some outstanding exceptions, there was less faculty development activity in the community colleges than may appear from the apparent abundance of workshops, lectures, travel funding, released time, sabbaticals, etc. discussed above and in Appendix E. Most of these activities were supported to a greater or lesser extent at the colleges, but our fieldwork and surveys suggest that (1) the overall level of support for these activities was fairly low at many colleges (perhaps reflecting program cutbacks in the face of resource restrictions in the '80's), and, (2) activities receiving the most emphasis were relatively inexpensive workshops organized by college faculty, rather than programs requiring expert outside consultants or extra full-time administrators (e.g., campus resource centers).

Some colleges administered faculty development programs on an _ad hoc_ basis, but most assigned an administrator, or a faculty member on released time, to coordinate and administer their programs on a part-time basis. Some larger colleges and districts assigned a full-time administrator to this task.

Comprehensive faculty development planning based on campus program planning and faculty needs assessments was rare, and development activities were seldom linked to evaluations of faculty performance. Faculty participation in program planning at some colleges has helped to move those campuses in the direction of an integrated and comprehensive approach to faculty development, but most programs supported isolated, "one-time" activities that had substantially less cumulative impact on the improvement of instruction and curriculum. Collective bargaining agreements in some districts required the involvement of faculty in planning development programs, or provided structured opportunities for faculty to propose their involvement.

At the community colleges, unlike UC and CSU, many faculty development services (e.g., workshops, lectures, classes) were developed by members of the faculty for presentation to their colleagues. This system (which was supported in part with grants of released time for faculty providers) benefited both sides -- faculty attending a workshop and faculty presenting the relevant material. And it had the potential to involve faculty in collegial and "self-help" activities that were potentially more effective than relying exclusively on information provided by outside experts. However, we know of no systematic attempts to capitalize on this aspect of community college faculty development in order to strengthen a "community of teacher-scholars."

Faculty development in the community colleges suffered from two other serious weaknesses. First, part-time faculty, who teach about one-third of the course load, were largely excluded from development activities. Many part-time faculty teach in vocational-technical programs, and stayed up to date through their association with business and industry. But most of these faculty did not have access to programs aimed at improving their teaching skills or helping them to remain current in their fields.

Finally, faculty development in the community colleges -- as at UC and CSU -- was heavily influenced, both in size and scope, by faculty demand. Many faculty participated in development activities because they were professionally motivated to maintain and improve their skills, but faculty retention, tenure and promotion did not depend on demonstrations of research skill and productivity. Continued regular salary advancement was assured by contract (there are no faculty ranks at CCC) once tenure was obtained, and only the most ineffective or irresponsible teacher needed to be concerned about the possible denial of tenure. (Faculty in most districts also qualified for small salary increments if they completed course work beyond the level of their terminal degree. This incentive applied to off-campus courses taken for credit at four-year institutions, or, by district agreement, to equivalent educational experience, and was ignored by many faculty.) Thus, student, peer or administrator evaluations of faculty performance, and feedback to faculty, were not tied to any career incentives for faculty to improve their teaching skills or maintain currency in their fields.

On balance, community college faculty development programs suffered from serious resource scarcities, and many colleges had not put available resources to effective use. Faculty participation in planning, preparing, and providing many development services was a potential strength, but it was underutilized.

2. Expenditures for Faculty Development

A. Estimated System-Level Incremental Expenditures

Table VI.1a shows the estimated FY 1985-86 expenditures for all CCC campuses for all faculty development activities, based on reports from a sample of sixty-two colleges.[28] On the basis of these reports, we estimate that:

> **CCC FY 1985-86 expenditures for faculty development from all sources were over $16 million, or an average of $1060 per FTE full-time teaching faculty member.**[29]

---

[28] As noted above, sixty-four colleges returned Campus Survey II in time for expenditure data to be included in this analysis. Data from two of these colleges were excluded in estimating system-wide expenditures, due to statistical or reliability problems that would have skewed the estimates. Volume III discusses the statistical estimation procedures employed to arrive at these estimates, and the sampling errors associated with the estimates.

[29] Expenditures per FTE full-time faculty are reported in order to provide a normalized basis for comparisons. If CCC FTE part-time faculty had been included in the reporting base, expenditures per FTE faculty member would have been $725. While a few colleges have unusually large fractions of part-time faculty, and some campuses try to provide some development opportunities for their part-time faculty, the participation of these faculty throughout the CCC system is generally quite limited.

TABLE VI.1.a

ESTIMATED PROGRAM EXPENDITURES FROM ALL SOURCES
Instruction- and Research-Related Expenditures
CCC

Fiscal Year 1985-86 Expenditures	
Total $ (Millions)	16.1
Average $ Per FTE Full-Time Teaching Faculty Member	1060
Percent of Campuses Spending an Average of --	
-- $0-$499 Per Faculty Member	40%
-- $500-$999 Per Faculty Member	32%
-- $1000 or More Per Faculty Member	28%

This total included expenditures for both instruction- and research-related faculty development.[30]

Table VI.1b shows that there was substantial variation in reported expenditures among CCC campuses. We estimate that:

> **About forty percent of the community colleges spent less than $500 per FTE full-time teaching faculty member for development programs. Another third of the colleges spent between $500 and $1,000 per faculty member, and less than thirty percent spent more than $1,000.**

These estimates include funds from state programs administered by the CCC Office of the Chancellor in support of faculty development. The Chancellor's Office has reported FY 1985-86 expenditures for faculty development of $1.8 million, for two state-supported programs: The Fund for Instructional Improvement ($0.3 million) and the Vocational/Technical Instructor and Career Counselor Inservice Training Project (AB 3938). The latter program provided funds for vocational/technical instructors to return to industry for up to six months to upgrade their technical skills and remain current with recent technologies and methods ($1.5 million).

There were no CCC expenditures reported for faculty affirmative action faculty development programs.

---

[30] CCC campus budget records generally did not allow estimates of differences in college spending for instruction- and research-related development.

TABLE VI.1.b

AVERAGE EXPENDITURES PER FTE FULL-TIME FACULTY MEMBER
Instruction- and Research-Related Expenditures
CCC Responding Sample, FY 1985-86*

1.	$ 0	32.	$ 571
2.	30	33.	590
3.	38	34.	600
4.	75	35.	607
5.	118	36.	650
6.	130	37.	702
7.	132	38.	715
8.	156	39.	756
9.	182	40.	789
10.	197	41.	790
11.	267	42.	823
12.	295	43.	825
13.	302	44.	903
14.	348	45.	991
15.	376	46.	1116
16.	373	47.	1155
17.	389	48.	1199
18.	397	49.	1293
19.	409	50.	1375
20.	435	51.	1463
21.	437	52.	1583
22.	440	53.	1606
23.	468	54.	2002
24.	472	55.	2079
25.	482	56.	2101
26.	504	57.	2271
27.	509	58.	2396
28.	520	59.	2572
29.	537	60.	2609
30.	549	61.	3795
31.	558	62.	6352

---

* In order to protect the confidentiality of college respondents, the number of FTE full-time faculty per college is not shown. These data show no relationship between college size and reported expenditures per FTE full-time faculty member.

Sources of Funds for Programmatic Expenditures. Almost all faculty development at CCC was supported by state funds. Table VI.2 provides estimates based on data reported by sixty-two colleges. The table shows that:

> **At CCC, almost ninety percent of faculty development program expenditures for both instruction- and research-related faculty development were supported by district and college funds available through state appropriations.[31] The balance of the funds came largely from other state programs, including programs administered by the Office of the Chancellor.**

B. Expenditures Related to Off-Campus Faculty Development Activities

The CCC faculty questionnaire asked faculty to report on their off-campus faculty development activities from March 31, 1986 - April 1, 1987. Table VI.3 shows estimated expenditures for these activities based on this information.

> **According to faculty reports, the total expenditures for off-campus faculty development were over $4 million at CCC.**
>
> **The average expenditure per CCC faculty member who participated in off-campus activities was $581.**

These estimates include off-campus activities intended for either research or instructional purposes. We also asked faculty at CCC to indicate their main objectives in pursuing specific off-campus activities, and we classified each reported activity as having either an instruction- or research-related purpose.

---

[31] State funds include community college funding allocated by the state but based on local revenues.

TABLE VI.2

ESTIMATED PROGRAMMATIC EXPENDITURES BY SOURCE
Instruction -and Research-Related Expenditures
CCC

Source	Fiscal Year 1985-86 Expenditures (Millions of $)	% of Total
State-Funded College and District Budgets*	13.2	82%
State Programs	1.8	11%
Other State Funding	.3	2%
Federal	.5	3%
Private Contracts or Grants	.3	2%
Professional Organizations	--	<1%
Other	--	<1%
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	16.1	100%

---

* In multiple college districts, colleges reported that 52 percent of college and district faculty development expenditures were from discretionary college budgets; 48 percent were expenditures of district funds allocated to the colleges and earmarked for faculty development, or district funds expended directly at the college for development services or support (e.g., district-controlled sabbatical leave budgets).

TABLE VI.3

ESTIMATED OFF-CAMPUS FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY
Instruction- and Research-Related Activity
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
CCC

% of Faculty Engaged in Off-Campus Activity	78%
Average Number of Activities Per Participating Faculty Member	2.5
Average Number of Days Per Participating Faculty Member for All Off-Campus Activity	9.5
Average Total Cost Per Participating Faculty Member for All Off-Campus Activity*	$581
Total Cost for All Off-Campus Activity (Millions)	$4.3

---

* Includes personal faculty funds

98

Table VI.4 shows the resulting estimates of the proportion of off-campus expenditures at CCC that were for instruction-related faculty development. Using these data, we estimate that:

> **The average expenditure per faculty member for off-campus instruction-related faculty development at CCC was $361.**

Sources of Support for Off-Campus Activities. Table VI.5 shows estimates of the sources of support for CCC off-campus development, activity, based on faculty reports. The data show that:

> **According to CCC faculty, personal funds were the largest single source of funds for off-campus activities. Almost sixty percent of such funding was personal.**
>
> **Division, college, or district funds were the next biggest source for off-campus expenditures, with about one-fourth of the costs coming from this source.**
>
> **All other funding sources were relatively minor.**

C. Other Types of Expenditures

Full-time faculty in many community college districts qualify for a step increase in salary if they complete additional credit coursework or equivalent training beyond the level of their earned degree. Six percent of the community college faculty reported that they had received a salary increase due to faculty development activities in 1986-87. The one-year cost to their districts is estimated to have been at least $0.6 million.[32]

---

[32] This figure does not include current district expenditures resulting from past increases, including additional COLA expenses as the result of a higher salary base.

TABLE VI.4

ESTIMATED OFF-CAMPUS FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY
Instruction-Related Activity Only
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
CCC

% of Faculty Engaged in Off-Campus Instruction-Related Activity	34%
Average Number of Instruction-Related Activities Per Participating Faculty Member	1.9
Average Number of Days Per Participating Faculty Member Spent in Instruction-Related Off-Campus Activity	5.9
Average Total Cost Per Participating Faculty Member for Instruction-Related Off-Campus Activity*	$361
Total Cost for All Instruction-Related Off-Campus Activity (Millions)	$1.7

---

* Includes personal faculty funds

TABLE VI.5

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES FOR OFF-CAMPUS ACTIVITY BY SOURCE
Instruction- and Research-Related Expenditures
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
CCC

	% of Total Expenditures		
Source	Research Related	Instruction Related	Sum
Federal Grant or Contract	4	0	4
State Grant or Contract	5	2	8
Private Grant or Contract	<1	0	<1
Division, College or District	14	11	25
Personal Funds	41	16	57
Sponsoring Organization	1	1	2
Other	3	2	5
Column Total	68%	32%	100%
TOTAL EXPENDITURES ($thds)	4091*		

---

* Excludes respondents who did not indicate a main objective. Total for all respondents, including those who did not indicate a main objective, is $4,185.

3. Participation in Faculty Development

Table VI.6 provides an overview of the amount of faculty development activity at CCC from March 31, 1986 - April 1, 1987. These data indicate that almost all CCC faculty engaged in at least some type of faculty development activity.

> **More than nine out of ten faculty engaged in some form of development activity during the year.**
>
> **The amount of time devoted to development was about one-tenth of the faculty's overall work time during the year.**

As at CSU, faculty development activities at CCC seem to have been both pervasive and thin. Table VI.7 provides additional detail with which to assess this conclusion; it is structured in the same manner as were the parallel tables IV.8 and V.8 in the preceding chapters. The data in Table VI.7 indicate that, as was the case for CSU faculty:

> **There was considerable variation in the rate of CCC faculty participation according to the type of development activity.**
>
> **The lowest level of participation was for activities that depended on programs designed by campuses (or the system) specifically for the purpose of faculty development.**[33]
>
> **The highest levels of faculty participation were for off-campus conference attendance, followed by private study activities and participation in on-campus conferences.**

---

[33] See Chapter IV, Note 18.

TABLE VI.6

ESTIMATED FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Broad Measures, Instruction- and Research-Related Development
CCC

% of Faculty Reporting Some Form of Faculty Development Activity	93%
Average Hours Per Year Per Participating Faculty Member Devoted to Faculty Development Activity	183
Average Hours Worked Per Week[*]	41
Average Proportion of Work Year Spent on Faculty Development if Faculty Work 44 Weeks Per Year[**]	.10

---

[*] This estimate is based on faculty responses to a question in the faculty questionnaire.

[**] The number of weeks in a work year is an arbitrary assumption used only for the purpose of placing professional development hours into a year's context.

TABLE VI.7

ESTIMATED FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Specific Activities, Instruction- and Research-Related Development
CCC

Type of Activity	Estimated % of Faculty Engaged in Faculty Development Activity
Videotaping of Own Teaching	14%
Observation of Peer's Classes	26%
Direct Assistance from Professional Development Specialists	17%
Mentoring Program as Mentor	8%
Mentoring Program as Mentored	6%
Studying Specialized Professional Development Materials (e.g., articles, training videos)	65%
Developing, Preparing and/or Teaching Experimental or New Courses and Curricula	50%
Attending On-Campus Course for Professional Development	20%
Attending Off-Campus Course for Professional Development	30%
Participating in On-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Prof. Devel.	49%
Participating in Off-Campus Conferences, Seminars, etc. Contributing to Prof. Devel.	69%
Attending Summer Institute	9%
Other	12%

As with the data for UC and CSU, we have grouped specific CCC faculty activities into broader categories in order to account for the multiple use of development activities. Table VI.8 shows the results of this regrouping. The data indicate that:

> **Almost all faculty participated in some form of development, and about three-fifths engaged both in programs designed specifically for faculty development and in the more general activities of conference attendance or private study.**

At CCC, it appears that about one in eight faculty members had little or no involvement, perhaps three out of ten faculty participated moderately, and as many as six out of ten participated actively in research- or instruction-related development.

Participation for Different Subgroups of Faculty. The following findings suggest that there was a systematic difference in participation among faculty of different gender.

> **The percentage of non-tenured full-time instructors at CCC engaging in faculty development was about the same as that of tenured faculty (though the data indicate that a higher percentage of non-tenured faculty engaged in developing new courses, participating in on-campus (but not off-campus) conferences, observing peer's classrooms, receiving assistance from specialists, attending off-campus courses, and being mentored). Generally speaking, there was more participation by females than males in faculty development activities.**
>
> **The gap between the genders was greatest for the highest level of participation -- programmatic activity combined with conferences and private-study. Women were more likely than men to engage in the maximum level of professional development.**

TABLE VI.8

ESTIMATED FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Overall Measures, Instruction- and Research-Related Development
CCC

Type of Activity	Estimated % of Faculty Engaged in Faculty Development Activity
No Faculty Development Activity	7%
Only Engaged in Private-Study	5%
Only Attended Conferences, Seminars, etc. and/or Engaged in Private-Study	25%
Only Participated in Program. Activity	5%
Participated in Program. Activity and Conferences or Private Study	58%
	100%

The Amount of Time Devoted to Development. The findings showing the large percentage of faculty engaged in some form of development do not speak to the amount of time spent by faculty on different types of development activities. Table VI.9 shows estimates of the average amount of time CCC faculty spent on development activity from March 31, 1987 - April 1, 1987. The data indicate that:

> **Faculty who participated only in programmatic activities averaged the most hours devoted to faculty development compared to other CCC faculty. This group constituted about five percent of the CCC faculty.**
>
> **Faculty who participated in both programmatic activities and conferences or private study -- the highest level of participation -- constituted about sixty percent of the CCC faculty.**

In summary, CCC faculty participation appears to have been pervasive (about sixty percent of the faculty engaged in a high level of faculty development), but the amount of time spent by these active faculty members was not extensive.

Research and Faculty Development. As at CSU, the study asked CCC faculty to indicate the amount of time they devoted to research as distinguished from other development activities. Table VI.10 shows various measures of faculty engagement in research at CCC, as reported by the faculty sample. The evidence indicates that:

TABLE VI.9

ESTIMATED FACULTY-TIME SPENT ON DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Overall Measures, Instruction- and Research-Related Development
CCC

Type of Activity	Average Number of Hours Per Year of Faculty Development Activity for Participating Faculty
Only Engaged in Private-Study	190
Only Attended Conferences, Seminars, etc.	40
Only Attended Conferences and Private-Study	169
Only Participated in Program. Activity	275
Participated in Program. Activity and Conferences or Private-Study	201

TABLE VI.10

ESTIMATED FACULTY-TIME SPENT ON RESEARCH
CCC

% of Faculty Who Conducted Research From August 15, 1986-April 1, 1987 or Summer 1986	46%
Average Hours Per Week Per Faculty Spent on Research by Faculty Who Conducted Research	
From August 15, 1986-April 1, 1987	10
During Summer 1986	13
Average Hours Per Week Per Faculty Spent on All Professional Duties (Including Research, Teaching, Advising, etc.) by All Faculty, March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987	
During Academic Year	41
During Summer 1986	18
Average Hours Per Week Per Faculty Spent on All Professional Duties (Including Research, Teaching, Advising, etc.) by Faculty Who Conducted Research, August 15, 1986-April 1, 1987	
During Academic Year	37
During Summer 1986	18
Proportion of Work Week Devoted to Research by Faculty Who Conducted Research, August 15, 1986-April 1, 1987	
During Academic Year	.27
During Summer 1986	.72

> **Approximately half of the CCC faculty reported having engaged in research between August 15, 1986 and April 1987.**[34]
>
> **Faculty who conducted research spent less than thirty percent of their time on research during the academic year, and spent most of their work time during the summer on research.**

Table VI.11 shows the sources of support for research, based on faculty reports.

> **Faculty who conducted research at CCC reported that about three-fourths of that work was not funded.**

As at CSU, faculty at CCC received released time for various development purposes, including research. Table VI.12 shows estimates of the extent of, and purpose for, released time. Based on faculty reports, we estimate that:

> **Less than one tenth of CCC faculty had released time in 1986-87.**
>
> **The primary purpose of this time was for instructional or curriculum development (and research aimed at improving instruction or curriculum).**

The data in Table VI.13 provide more precise information about the relationship at CCC between research and faculty development.

> **No development activity was exclusively used for research, though research purposes were cited by some faculty for activities usually identified as related to teaching.**
>
> **At CCC, the only activities for which about half the faculty indicated a research purpose were attendance at off-campus courses or summer institutes and studying specialized materials.**

---

[34] As noted earlier, research at CCC is often focused on teaching, curriculum, or some aspect of the community colleges as institutions.

TABLE VI.11

SOURCES OF SUPPORT FOR FACULTY TIME SPENT ON RESEARCH
CCC

Source of Support for Faculty Research Time	Average % of Support from Funding Source Acad. Year	Summer*
No Funding	74%	79%
Only Federal Grant or Contract	1%	2%
Only State Grant or Contract	3%	1%
Only Private Sector, Foundation Grant or Contract or Other	9%	9%
Only Campus or System Funding	11%	7%
More Than One Extramural Source	<1%	<1%
Campus or System Plus Other Sources	2%	<1%
Total	100%	98%

---

* Due to rounding, does not add to 100%.

TABLE VI.12

USE OF RELEASED TIME
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
CCC

Estimated % of Faculty Who Had Released Time Between March 31, 1986 and April 1, 1987	6%
Estimated Proportion of Released Time Used for:	
Instructional Purposes Only	.24
Curriculum Purposes Only	.22
Curriculum and Instructional Only	.06
Research Only	.15
Research Plus Other Purposes	.27
Purpose Not Reported	.04
Total	.98*

---

* Due to rounding, does not add to 1.00.

TABLE VI.13

ESTIMATED INSTRUCTION-RELATED DEVELOPMENT
March 31, 1986-April 1, 1987
Specific Activities
CCC

Type of Activity	Estimated Percent of Faculty Who Engaged in Activity and Who had Instruction-Related Objectives as Primary Purpose for Engaging in Activity
Videotaping of Own Teaching	13%
Observation of Peer's Classes	22%
Direct Assist. from Specialists	14%
Mentoring Program as Mentor	07%
Mentoring Program as Mentored	05%
Studying Specialized Materials	38%
Developing New Curricula	43%
Attending On-Campus Course	14%
Attending Off-Campus Course	15%
Participating in On-Campus Conference	*
Participating in Off-Campus Conference	*
Attending Summer Institute	04%

---

* Since there are multiple conferences per faculty member encompassed under this category, we have not classified faculty on this variable.

Table VI.13 also shows the extent of faculty participation in instruction-related activities at CCC. These data suggest that if research-related activities were eliminated from the definition of faculty development at CCC, instructional improvement would still have occupied a significant fraction of faculty development activity. As discussed earlier, however, activities specifically designed to advance faculty development did not have high levels of faculty participation, whether they were instruction- or research-related. These data, together with our fieldwork evidence, reinforce the strong impression that the campuses were generally underfunded for their faculty development activities, and that many faculty lacked either the time or incentives to pursue such development vigorously.

VII. PERCEIVED NEEDS FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Despite the variety of faculty development activities occurring at the three segments, the level of activity per faculty member is not high, and may be inadequate for the continuing and changing needs of the teaching faculty. This chapter examines faculty needs in detail. First, we report on the faculty's perception of their own needs. We then describe how administrators view faculty and campus needs, as reported in our campus-level questionnaires and described to us during our fieldwork visits.

1. Faculty Perceptions of Needs

The questionnaire asked faculty to rate a series of needs according to how adequate they felt the current level of support was for a particular need. Table VII.1 shows the answers to these questions by displaying the estimated percentage of faculty who said that the current level of support for a particular need was adequate or better than adequate. These responses suggest the following:

> **At UC, a slight majority of the faculty indicated that support was adequate for improving the instructional abilities of faculty and efforts to address student learning needs. Only a minority felt that support was adequate for improving faculty abilities to use technology or develop curricula.**

TABLE VII.1

ADEQUACY OF CURRENT SUPPORT FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT
Faculty Views

Type of Activity	Estimated % of Faculty Who Say That Current Support for Faculty Development is Adequate or Better than Adequate		
	UC	CSU	CCC
Improving Instructional Ability	59%	39%	38%
Improving Ability to Use Technology	37%	42%	41%
Developing Curricula	41%	39%	41%
Addressing Students' Learning Needs	51%	41%	46%
Increasing Knowledge/Maintaining Currency	*	18%	31%

---

* Not asked at UC.

> **At CSU and CCC, only a minority of faculty felt that the current level of support was adequate or better than adequate for any area of faculty development. The lowest percentage of faculty at both segments thought that support was adequate for the research-related area "increasing knowledge or maintaining currency" (At CSU, we estimate that less than one in five faculty thought the research area received adequate support; at CCC, the comparable estimate is less than one in three.)**

These perceptions of the adequacy of current support for faculty development obviously suggest areas where faculty might favor more support. Rather than leave this important issue to inference, we also asked faculty to indicate how much additional emphasis should be placed on supporting the various areas of faculty development.[35] Table VII.2 shows the results, which largely mirror the above findings except for several areas:

> **About seventy percent of UC faculty believed more emphasis should be placed on improving the faculty's ability to use new technology. Also, we estimate that about six out of ten faculty believed that more emphasis on curriculum development was needed, and about forty percent believed that efforts to improve the faculty's instructional ability should receive more emphasis.**
>
> **At CSU and CCC, a sizeable majority of faculty believed that more emphasis should be placed on all areas of faculty development. The highest percentage of faculty felt that research-related development merits additional emphasis. (We estimate that nine out of ten faculty at CSU believed research-related development should be emphasized; the comparable estimate at CCC was eight out of ten faculty.)**

These findings are based on faculty ratings of needs without regard to the trade-offs that restrict how much funding can be

---

[35] Faculty were asked to rate each area of need according to whether the emphasis on the area should be much less, less, stay the same, be higher, or much higher. Table VII.2 combines the categories "higher and much higher" into one category, which the table and text call "more or much more emphasis".

TABLE VII.2

HOW FACULTY DEVELOPMENT EMPHASIS SHOULD BE CHANGED
Faculty Views

	Estimated % of Faculty Who Believe that More or Much More Emphasis Should be Placed on Faculty Development		
Type of Activity	UC	CSU	CCC
Improving Instructional Ability	42%	60%	67%
Improving Ability to Use Technology	69%	65%	65%
Developing Curricula	59%	72%	63%
Addressing Students' Learning Needs	49%	56%	62%
Increasing Knowledge/Maintaining Currency	*	91%	82%

---

* Not asked at UC.

made available for faculty development. We asked another series of questions in which we presented faculty with a forced choice: faculty were asked to indicate what percentage of new moneys they would allocate to each of a limited set of needs. The results are shown in Tables VII.3 to VII.5.

Table VII.3 displays estimates of how faculty at CSU and CCC said they would allocate additional funds among research, teaching, and curriculum development needs.[36] The results show very different priorities between CSU and CCC faculty:

> **CSU faculty placed the highest priority on research, and the lowest on furthering teaching improvement efforts.**
>
> **CCC faculty assigned about equal priority for spending additional funds between research, teaching, and curriculum development, with research receiving somewhat lower priority.**

The research component in this forced choice can be clarified by the information presented in Table VII.4, which shows the results of asking the faculty to make a forced choice among various types of research-related needs:

> **CSU faculty favored new money for conducting research (with maintaining currency not very far behind).**
>
> **CCC faculty assigned the highest priority for new money to maintaining currency in their fields.**
>
> **Both CSU and CCC faculty favored allocating about thirteen percent of any new funds to enhancing research skills and disseminating research results.**

The issue of needs can be also be examined from the standpoint of how faculty would allocate new funding among object

---

[36] Because it was agreed that the study would focus only on instructional improvement at UC, University officials requested that UC faculty not be asked this question.

TABLE VII.3

HOW ADDITIONAL FUNDS SHOULD BE ALLOCATED FOR RESEARCH, TEACHING, OR CURRICULUM

Faculty Views

CSU and CCC

Type of Need	Estimated Average % of Additional Funds CSU	CCC
Furthering Research	55%	28%
Furthering Teaching Improvement	19	37
Furthering Curriculum Development	26	35
	100%	100%

TABLE VII.4

HOW ADDITIONAL FUNDS SHOULD BE ALLOCATED FOR RESEARCH CATEGORIES
Faculty Views
CSU and CCC

Type of Need	Estimated Average % of Additional Funds	
	CSU	CCC
Conducting Research	38%	18%
Enhancing Research Skills	13	12
Disseminating Research Results	14	13
Maintaining Currency in Field	33	56
Other	2	1
	100%	100%

TABLE VII.5

HOW ADDITIONAL FUNDS SHOULD BE ALLOCATED ACROSS FUNDING CATEGORIES
Faculty Views

	Estimated Average % of Additional Funds		
Funding Objectives	UC	CSU	CCC
Travel, Including Conf. Attendance	17%	29%	27%
Membership in Professional Assocs.	4	6	8
Secretarial Support	17	12	13
Reduced Teaching Load	21	34	22
Supplies and Equipment (Including Computers)	31	17	27
Other	10	2	3
	100%	100%	100%

categories -- travel, membership in faculty organizations, secretarial support, reduced teaching load, and supplies and equipment. Table VII.5 shows the results of asking faculty at all three segments to make this choice. The findings show some differences across segments:

> **At UC, faculty assigned the highest resource needs for supplies and equipment, with travel, secretarial support, and reduced teaching load as secondary priorities.**
>
> **At CSU, reduced teaching load and travel received the highest priority.**
>
> **At CCC, the faculty indicated their highest priority was for travel, supplies and equipment, and reduced teaching load.**

2. Needs as Perceived by Administrations

As described earlier, campus-level surveys were created with the help of segment and campus representatives. A section of these instruments asked for the views of campus administrations on the areas of greatest need for faculty development. These issues were also discussed in detail with administrators during the study's fieldwork visits to selected campuses at each segment.

A. University of California

University of California officials declined to have individual campuses respond to questions about faculty development needs; they explained that all University needs are discussed internally and then expressed for the institution as a whole in the President's annual budget document.[37] The discussion that follows is based on fieldwork interviews with administrators on four campuses as well as telephone contact with all UC campuses.

As noted earlier, the situation at each UC campus is unique, and therefore the needs across campuses vary greatly. It was beyond the scope of this research to conduct in-depth studies of each campus. Instead, we sought broad impressions in our fieldwork, telephone interviews, and other contacts that might characterize needs for this segment as a whole, realizing that some generalizations might not be wholly accurate at some campuses. The following discussion should be read with this caveat in mind.

UC administrators generally regarded research as their first priority, but on most campuses they were also concerned -- in some cases deeply so -- with the quality of undergraduate instruction. They consistently distinguished between the generous resources that were often available for research, and the relative absence of resources set aside explicitly to help faculty improve the quality of curriculum and instruction. Administrators identified three areas where additional support for faculty development was needed: resources, information, and organization. Resource needs included money and time to develop courses and labs (e.g., summer grants, paid leaves), though administrators pointed out that many faculty members would be reluctant to commit significant blocks of time to non-research work, because research productivity has high priority at UC (and is crucial to faculty advancement).

---

[37] The most recent available University budget document contains no requests for state funding for general faculty development, but does mention Special Regent's Programs supported by the University Opportunity Fund (the UC share of indirect costs recovered on federal research grants and contracts) that provide non-state funds for faculty and staff affirmative action development programs and for the University Instructional Improvement Program -- block grants to the campuses to support instructional improvement.

Administrators felt that faculty needed more information about teaching methods, and were looking for better ways to evaluate teaching. But they were uncertain about the extent to which such information would be used, and how it should be presented. They felt that faculty were unlikely voluntarily to spend much time attending courses or seminars on teaching methods, and that written information (newsletters, bulletins, etc.) had limited value.[38]

Finally, organizational needs were discussed. Campuses varied greatly in the extent to which they had institutionalized programs for and spent resources on faculty development, as Chapter IV details. On campuses that did not have resource centers, there was broad agreement on the need for coordinators and consultants to help with curriculum and evaluate teaching practices. There was also broad agreement on all campuses visited by the study that some way needed to be found to help faculty who were genuinely poor teachers. Two suggestions were often proffered: first, faculty mentoring programs for new faculty, both to give them advice on teaching and to help them adjust to university life in general (though data presented in Volume III suggest that such programs did not receive as a high a rating for effectiveness as did most other faculty development activities); and, second, more concentration on the teaching skills of graduate students -- before they were given assignments as teaching assistants or new assistant professors.[39] Some respondents also felt that someone in each school or department should be in charge of improving the quality of undergraduate instruction -- that both faculty and administrators needed to exert more leadership and take more responsibility to make sure that good teaching was occurring.

---

[38] Those faculty who had occasion to obtain consulting assistance from a campus resource center largely valued the help they had received. Our faculty sample at UC felt that this type of help was effective, but only a small percentage of the faculty participated in such activity.

B. California State University

Surveys sent to each CSU campus asked for the views of the campus administration on the areas of greatest need for faculty development. Campus administrations were first asked to assess the current adequacy of support for faculty development on their campus, in six areas shown in Table VII.6, which also presents their answers to this question:

> **About two-thirds of CSU campuses (as represented by the responses of their administrations) believed that support for faculty development on their campus was largely inadequate, whereas one-third of the campuses rated their support as adequate to very high.**

---

[39] This study's charter did not include gathering data on instructional development for teaching assistants and other graduate students. Efforts to provide this kind of help to graduate students appeared to be underway on most UC campuses, including assistance from resource centers on those campuses where centers were in operation.

TABLE VII.6

ADEQUACY OF CURRENT SUPPORT FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT
Views of Campus Administrations
CSU

	Number of Campuses Viewing Current Level of Support to be				
	Very Low	Low	About Right	High	Extr. High
Improving Faculty Instructional Abilities	4	9	2	1	3
Developing Curricula	2	10	5	1	1
Addressing Student Learning Needs	6	6	3	1	3
Increase Knowledge and/or Other Research/Performance Activities	5	8	2	1	3
Maintaining Currency in the Field	0	13	2	1	3
Retraining Faculty to Teach in New Areas*	7	6	3	2	0

---

* Eighteen campuses responded to this question.

A second part of this question asked campus administrations to indicate how they believed the emphasis should change at their institutions over the next five years in each of these faculty development areas. Table VII.7 presents the results for this part of the question:

> **Over three-fourths of CSU campus administrations felt there should be considerably more effort made in faculty development, except for the area of retraining faculty to teach in new areas, where nine of sixteen campuses responding felt that their current programs were at about the right level.**

CSU campus administrations largely shared the CSU faculty concern for strengthening research, but in contrast to the faculty, administrations also emphasized the need for developing faculty abilities to address the learning needs of CSU's diverse students, and improvement of faculty instructional abilities.

Campus administrations were also asked to make a forced choice in response to a question about what percentage of new funds should be allocated among office space, clerical and technical support, equipment, equipment maintenance, reduction in teaching load, and reduction in non-teaching load. (These categories were developed in discussions with representatives of the campuses.) Table VII.8 shows the results:

> **On average, CSU administrations felt that reduction in faculty teaching load should receive the highest allocation from new funding. The next funding priorities would be clerical and technical support plus new equipment.**

The results from the faculty questionnaire reported earlier showed that reduced teaching load also was the highest priority,

TABLE VII.7

HOW FACULTY DEVELOPMENT EMPHASIS SHOULD BE CHANGED
Views of Campus Administrations
CSU

	Number of Campuses Saying Level of Support Should be				
	Much Less	Less	Stay Same	Higher	Much Higher
Improving Faculty Instructional Abilities	0	3	0	10	6
Developing Curricula	1	1	3	12	2
Addressing Student Learning Needs	1	1	3	5	9
Increase Knowledge and/or Other Research/Performance Activities	2	1	1	8	7
Maintaining Currency in the Field*	1	0	2	7	8
Retraining Faculty to Teach in New Areas**	0	1	8	6	1

---

* Eighteen campuses responded to this question.

** Sixteen campuses responded to this question.

TABLE VII.8

HOW CAMPUS ADMINISTRATORS WOULD ALLOCATE ADDITIONAL FUNDS
CSU

Area of Resource Need	Average % of Additional Funds that Campuses Would Allocate to Resource Needs
Office Space	9%
Clerical and Secretarial Support	21%
Equipment	16%
Equipment Maintenance	8%
Reduction in Teaching Load	43%
Reduction in Non-teaching Load	3%
	100%

which agrees with the administrators' views, and that travel was next highest. The forced choice question asked on the campus-level survey did not include a category for travel funds. However, we asked administrators to comment on an open-ended question about other resource needs. By coding the responses to this question, we found:

> **CSU administrations also believed that more resources should be devoted to faculty travel.**

Clearly, most CSU campus administrations felt strongly that their faculties were in serious need of additional development support. In addition to the general concerns expressed above, fieldwork at five CSU campuses and telephone contact with virtually all campuses found that administrators in technical fields were particularly concerned that without adequate time and resources for faculty to remain current, curriculum and instruction have suffered. While often defending the quality of instruction on their campuses, they pointed out that much of the burden in technical fields has fallen on younger and part-time faculty, because resources have not been available to help older faculty keep up to date or retrain. At the same time, information changes so rapidly in some fields (e.g., computers, electrical engineering, biochemistry), that new Ph.D.'s can be teaching obsolete information in only a few years unless they too have adequate opportunities to remain current in their fields.[40]

---

[40] Faculty and administrators also pointed out that state support for research and scholarship has a multiplier effect -- it helps to attract private support for these activities. Conversely, it is harder to obtain non-state funding without more

A desire to obtain teaching assistants or class readers was tied to concerns about instructional quality. We were told that some CSU students -- including students who have gone on to graduate schools -- have graduated without ever having used a library, written a paper, or answered an essay question on an examination, because some classes were so large, and faculty taught so many students, that dealing with individual papers (or anything but multiple choice tests) was impossible.

The System-Level Perspective. Administrators in the Office of the Chancellor responded to the needs questions on the campus-level surveys in order to summarize system-level views of CSU faculty development needs. On each of the areas previously listed in Table VII.6, they agreed with most campus administrations that the adequacy of support was very low, and believed there should be significantly more emphasis in the future:

> **CSU system-level administrators believed that the greatest needs for faculty development are for the faculty to have increased knowledge about student learning styles, be able to use new instructional technologies and methods, maintain currency in substantive disciplines, and receive help in obtaining external grant support.**

As far as resource needs are concerned:

> **CSU system-level administrators identified three areas as having the greatest need for additional faculty development funds -- resources to help increase instructional expertise, travel support for attendance at professional meetings, and support for research.**

---

evidence of a state commitment.

In a separate communication, the CSU Office of the Chancellor provided additional detail on some of these views. One of its faculty development priorities was the improvement of instructional skills, particularly:

1. A better understanding of adult learning processes
2. Learning how to match teaching styles to student needs
3. Learning how to teach multicultural populations
4. Learning how to teach underprepared and beginning students
5. Staying current with instructional technology (computers, media, library methods, etc.)

Another high priority was support for more faculty research, scholarship, and creative activity, including sabbatical leaves. Chancellor's Office staff also felt that support for faculty retraining was important, to enhance faculty abilities to teach in new disciplines as well as improve their current course offerings. Finally, the Chancellor's Office wanted to see motivational and morale building programs offered, including programs that provide development and growth experiences at varying stages of faculty careers.[41]

C. California Community Colleges

As with CSU, surveys were sent to each CCC campus asking for the views of the campus administration on the areas of greatest need for faculty development. Tables VII.9 - VII.11 present estimates of CCC campus administration views, based on responses from sixty-four campuses.[42]

---

[41] Such programs are currently offered by the Center for Faculty Development at CSU Long Beach; see Appendix D.

Table VII.9 shows estimated campus responses to the question requesting an assessment of the current adequacy of support for faculty development on CCC campuses in each of six areas:

> **Eighty-five percent of CCC campus administrations felt that support was low or very low for faculty efforts to address student learning needs, and eighty percent of the campuses rated support as low or very low for retraining faculty to teach in new areas.**
>
> **Fewer campus administrations were concerned with current levels of support for faculty efforts to maintain currency in their fields and develop curricula. About three-fifths of the campuses thought that support was low or very low in these areas.**

The second part of this question asked campus administrations how they believed the emphasis at their colleges should change over the next five years in each of these six development areas. Table VII.10 shows the estimated results for this part of the question:

> **Virtually all CCC campus administrations felt there should be higher or much higher levels of support for improving faculty abilities to address student learning needs, and nine out of ten campuses thought that support should be higher or much higher for improving faculty instructional abilities.**
>
> **About three-fourths of the campuses said that faculty research and curriculum development should receive higher or much higher support over the next five years.**

---

[42] Responses were to Campus Survey II, described above in Chapter VI.

TABLE VII.9

ADEQUACY OF CURRENT SUPPORT FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT
Estimated Views of Campus Administrations*
CCC

	Percent of Campuses Viewing Current Level of Support to be Low or Very Low
Improving Faculty Instructional Abilities	75%
Developing Curricula	60%
Addressing Student Learning Needs	85%
Increase Knowledge and/or Other Research/Performance Activities	70%
Maintaining Currency in the Field	57%
Retraining Faculty to Teach in New Areas	80%

---

* Sixty-three campuses responded to this question.

TABLE VII.10

HOW FACULTY DEVELOPMENT EMPHASIS SHOULD BE CHANGED
Estimated Views of Campus Administrations
CCC

	Percent of Campuses Saying Level of Support Should be Higher or Much Higher
Improving Faculty Instructional Abilities	92%
Developing Curricula	78%
Addressing Student Learning Needs	97%
Increase Knowledge and/or Other Research/Performance Activities	75%
Maintaining Currency in the Field	85%
Retraining Faculty to Teach in New Areas	81%

Campus administrations were also asked the same "forced choice" question asked of CSU campus administrations. Table VII.11 shows the estimated results:

> **CCC campus administrations were interested in securing additional equipment, obtaining more clerical support, and reducing faculty teaching loads.**

Study fieldwork and telephone contacts provided other information about the concerns of CCC administrators. As shown in campus answers to survey questions (see Table VII.10), administrators felt that faculty needed support for activities that could improve their teaching skills. This was particularly true, they believed, for new faculty. They were concerned, moreover, that while many faculty were motivated by their own sense of professionalism to improve their teaching skills, there were few formal incentives to seek such assistance, and that faculty most in need of help were usually least likely to look for it. A related topic that came up repeatedly was the need to provide instructional training for part-time faculty, who bear a large fraction of CCC's teaching load. Part-time faculty were viewed as having the least incentive to seek such help.

Two means often mentioned for supporting instructional improvement were released time and travel funding. While there was considerable variation between campuses, many administrators noted that faculty found it difficult to attend off-campus courses or seminars on teaching or on disciplinary interests, because

TABLE VII.11

HOW CAMPUS ADMINISTRATORS WOULD ALLOCATE ADDITIONAL FUNDS
CCC Estimates*

Area of Resource Need	Average % of Additional Funds that Campuses Would Allocate to Resource Needs
Office Space	7%
Clerical and Secretarial Support	23%
Equipment	32%
Equipment Maintenance	13%
Reduction in Teaching Load	19%
Reduction in Non-teaching Load	6%
	100%

---

* Sixty-two campuses responded to this question.

their teaching load was heavy and it was difficult to find the resources needed to hire someone to cover faculty classes while they were away.

System-Level Views. Staff from the Office of the Chancellor provided the study with information that summarized their views on the need for faculty development at CCC. They identified a number of issues that caused them to be concerned about current levels of preparation among community college faculty:

1. Shifts in student enrollment patterns that have created a need for faculty retraining or additional education;
2. Increasing numbers of underprepared students who will create a need for new curricula and teaching strategies;
3. Projections showing that one-third of full-time community college faculty will reach retirement age over the next decade;
4. Underrepresentation of minorities and women among faculty and administrators; and
5. Rapid advances in knowledge and technology that have made it difficult for faculty in many fields to remain current.

These issues were seen against a background of growing demands for improving the abilities of the colleges to assess and counsel students; strengthen academic standards; and increase transfer rates. In light of these issues and demands:

> **CCC Chancellor's Office staff felt that substantially more state resources need to be devoted to faculty development to improve instructional skills, keep faculty current in their fields, strengthen curriculum and assessment, and support the organizational changes that will be needed to improve the effectiveness of college programs.**

In support of these priorities, Chancellor's Office staff pointed out that funding declines in recent years had forced many districts to cut back on faculty development activities, and they felt that educational quality has suffered as a result. They said they would provide most new resources directly to districts, which should continue to have the primary responsibility for faculty development; at the same time, they believed the Chancellor's Office should undertake to provide some direct services in this area to all the colleges.

APPENDICES A THROUGH F

APPENDIX A

COMMON INSTRUCTION-RELATED FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES AT UC

FY 1985-86

1. Direct presentation of information and ideas was a common means for providing assistance to faculty. Orientation meetings for first-year faculty served to introduce them to the formal and informal expectations of their campuses and departments; a number of departments also organized seminars for their faculty on topics such as student advising or instructional approaches. Lectures on teaching practices were occasionally offered by departments, schools, or campus organizations, but workshops were a more common format for presenting information. UC campuses reported organizing workshops to help faculty sharpen their skills in curriculum development, student advising, teaching techniques, student assessment, and instructional computing. Department retreats were far less common, but were occasionally employed for coordinating curriculum planning or discussing broad department goals.

2. Specialist assistance was often required for advice on the use of instructional media (e.g., audio-visual equipment, graphics), and many campuses maintained media service centers with staff that could provide this assistance. Assistance to faculty on the use of mini- and micro-computers was also common, including advice on software acquisition or use, or technical assistance on instructional computing. This advice usually came from specialists associated with campus computing facilities.

A few experts were available at some campuses to consult with faculty who wanted to have their teaching styles evaluated and critiqued, obtain advice on teaching techniques or curriculum design, or learn more about how to advise or assess students or how to evaluate their own courses.

3. Provision or repair of equipment, and provision of materials needed for teaching, supported faculty instruction and curriculum development throughout the University, though levels of service varied significantly among campuses. A common service of this kind was the provision of audio-visual materials or equipment, including television equipment. A number of campuses supported or helped to support an instructional media center that can produce videotapes, slides, photographs, or printed material for classroom use. Audio-visual equipment delivery, service, and repair were also available, and faculty in some instances had access to an instructional media library. Computation centers on UC campuses provided faculty with computer access for instructional purposes, often made instructional software available, and were relied on for servicing and repairing micro-computers and terminals used for instruction.

4. Grants and mini-grants were awarded competitively to faculty for projects related to the improvement of teaching -- including testing or developing new approaches to instruction -- or for the planning or development of new courses or the improvement of existing curriculum, including the development of instructional software. Many of these grants were part of a University-wide Instructional Improvement Program -- funded from block allocations to the campuses from one of the Special Regents' Programs that are financed by the University Opportunity Fund, which comes from the UC share of indirect costs recovered on federal grants and contracts supporting faculty research.

5. Awards for distinguished teaching or advising were not uncommon. Sponsors varied from alumni or student associations to department deans or campus committees. The awards usually provided modest stipends; some entailed recognition and prestige but did not include money.

6. Dissemination of instruction-related information was widely employed by all levels within campuses. While the responsibility for this activity was often decentralized to departments, campus resource centers, school deans' offices and campus level administrators all provided the faculty with bulletins, notices, brochures and other information about campus services such as media or computer support, or information about grant opportunities for projects related to instruction or curriculum.

7. Peer assistance programs were not active at all campuses, but at least one campus had a faculty mentor program in which senior faculty counseled new faculty on topics ranging from instruction and curriculum to how to secure campus or department support for research projects. This program payed a token stipend to the junior faculty member for accepting the mentor relationship; other campuses were looking into establishing mentor programs without such stipends.

8. Evaluations of faculty teaching were not considered by all campuses to be a means for faculty development, but student evaluations -- including feedback on teaching performance from student committees -- provided information to faculty and to academic administrators that was often used to modify instructional approaches or curriculum. Campus departments reported that teaching performance was taken into consideration during evaluations for promotion, though it did not play a major role.

APPENDIX B

EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS AT UC

A Teaching Resources Center

The Teaching Resources Center at UC Davis was an impressive example of the resource center approach to professional development. The Center was managed by a member of the Davis faculty on half-time appointment, and reported that its services were provided by the equivalent of nine full-time staff (including clerical and administrative personnel). The staff were not "teaching experts" -- that is, their professional degrees are in disciplines other than education.[1] It was felt that University faculty would be more receptive to advice on teaching from staff trained in substantive disciplines.

The Center offered individual consultations to faculty on classroom presentation skills, interactions with students, testing and grading, and related issues. As an aid to the evaluation and improvement of teaching, class sessions or "dry runs" of lectures could be videotaped for review by an instructor alone, with colleagues, or with a Center consultant. One service offered was a "class interview" -- a Center staff member met with an instructor's class for twenty minutes without the instructor present, to elicit information from students on the strengths and weaknesses of the course, including instruction. Feedback on students' views was later provided to the instructor, with advice, where appropriate, on possible improvements. The Center also helped instructors design student evaluation forms or select one of several standard forms; distributed the evaluation questionnaires in class; and tabulated the results and provided them to the instructor.

Interested faculty could also obtain a number of other services from the Center, including automated scoring of multiple choice tests, the use of equipment for making classroom visual aids, and access to a micro-computer self-help lab to learn about computer systems and software packages. The Center organized conferences, lectures and workshops on teaching; published a quarterly newsletter with information about instructional programs, interviews with faculty about teaching, tips on teaching, and related information; circulated monographs and articles on teaching and curriculum; published a manual describing the size, layout, and features of every classroom on campus; and maintained a library of books and journals on teaching. New faculty members were given an orientation session each fall to acquaint them with Center services and other instructional resources on campus.

---

[1] With the exception of the Director, staff were not members of the UC Davis faculty.

Four other activities rounded out the Center's program: (1) training for graduate students -- orientations, workshops, lectures, seminars, courses -- in the development of teaching skills; (2) program evaluation -- assistance to departments and curriculum review committees in designing faculty, student and alumni surveys and tabulating results; (3) administration of approximately $300,000 in Undergraduate Instructional Improvement Program grants and consultation with grant applicants prior to their submission of project proposals; and (4) research on teaching, to increase Center staff knowledge and to provide information on teaching to faculty and administrators.

Because faculty utilization of the Center was voluntary, the Center publicized its services as widely as possible through campus, school and department channels. Nevertheless, Center staff admitted that most faculty did not use Center services, though demand has been growing slowly. Since its beginnings in 1974, the Center has been strongly supported by UCD administration, faculty senates, and other faculty committees concerned with the quality of instruction, but it has been largely left to Center staff to create demand for its services.

The Center attempted to coordinate its activities with other campus instructional support organizations (e.g., a student Learning Skills Center, a Writing Center), but was not always successful. The campus had a large and well-funded Instructional Media Center, for example, with a forty-member professional staff that provided a wide range of media support to faculty at no charge to departments or projects. But while liaison was maintained, there were no operational links between the Media Center and the Teaching Resources Center, and they were located in separate facilities some distance apart.

Resource centers at other campuses offered similar services. At UC Berkeley, for example, the Office of Educational Development was created in 1984-85, and has become permanently funded by the campus at a reported staffing level of eight FTE (including clerical and administrative staff). The OED offered consultation on teaching, curriculum, writing and speech issues; evaluation of instruction through videotape feedback and student questionnaires; distribution of monographs on teaching; a newsletter, faculty guide for new teachers, and other publications; and related services, including training for graduate teaching assistants. The Office also organized workshops, seminars, and lectures on teaching, provided policy planning and evaluation services to other campus units concerned with teaching and curriculum, and administered approximately $615,000 in campus Instructional Improvement Fund grants.

A Grass Roots Professional Development Program

During the 1985-86 academic year, incidents of sexual harassment and gender discrimination in the UC Berkeley Department of Forestry and Resource Management prompted a small group of students to look for ways to bring sexual harassment issues to the attention of students and faculty, and eventually to influence student and faculty behavior. With the support of the Department Head, the students attended a national conference on the role of women in the professions, and returned resolved to take action within the Department to deal with these issues.

In spring 1986, students in the Department elected a Gender Discrimination and Harassment Committee to increase student, faculty and staff awareness of discrimination and harassment issues, and to provide support for individuals who felt they were being discriminated against or sexually harassed. With the active support of the Department Head, the Committee decided to organize workshops led by professionals from outside the Department, and set about seeking the necessary funding and investigating potential workshop presenters. By January 1987, two presenters had been selected, and most of the necessary funding had been secured, including support from the Department, the campus Women's Center, and the graduate student organization. Following individual notices and follow-up with faculty, students, and staff, about three-fourths of the faculty, sixty percent of the Department staff, and half of the graduate and undergraduate students attended the workshops. Questionnaires distributed to attendees revealed that the workshops were considered successful, and plans were made for continuing and expanding the work of the Committee.

Unlike most organized faculty development activities, the Department of Forestry and Resource Management program was a grass roots effort in which faculty, students, and staff came together to coordinate work on a controversial issue. There was no central administrative mandate, and not much money to spend. But because the program had the benefit of volunteers' energy, peer cooperation, and broad-based participation, a modest budget was able to leverage a significant effort that has had high payoff. Indications are that the workshops -- and the process of mobilizing support and advice -- have succeeded in changing attitudes and behavior in the Department.

A Coordinated Approach to Instructional Improvement

UC San Francisco is a medical campus that deals almost exclusively with graduate students, in four schools -- Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy, and Nursing. And while it provided many of the professional development services and support programs available at the eight general UC campuses, it could be argued that its special student body, subject concentrations, and attention to clinical teaching distinguish UCSF from other campuses in ways that make profitable comparisons difficult or impossible.

Perhaps because so much is at stake in the teaching of medicine, however, UCSF has made some special efforts to improve instruction, including a widely recognized fellowship program in urban family practice that has prepared family physicians to teach in departments of family medicine in urban settings.

One innovative approach to professional development at UCSF was the recent decision by the School of Medicine to appoint an Assistant Dean for Teaching and Teaching Evaluation -- a doctor with experience in medical publications and administration. The Assistant Dean consulted with faculty on instructional problems, acted as an ombudsman between students and faculty on issues related to teaching, worked with student feedback committees, and helped train graduate and post-doctoral students in teaching methods. She has also begun to offer a ten-session course on good teaching for School of Medicine faculty, and post-doctoral and graduate students. Attending faculty received a detailed course syllabus, and were expected to attend regularly and participate fully in classroom discussions. Attendance was voluntary, and so far the course has been attended by less than two percent of the School of Medicine faculty, but demand was reported to be growing.

The School of Medicine has thus taken two unusual steps to promote professional development for improved teaching: It has appointed a department-level administrator to deal exclusively with issues of teaching quality, thereby greatly elevating the salience and legitimacy of concerns for good teaching; and it has supported the development and presentation of a formal course on teaching for its own faculty -- going well beyond the occasional workshop, seminar, or lecture. Since these were relatively new activities (not all faculty were yet fully aware of them), it is too early to assess their effects.

APPENDIX C

COMMON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES AT CSU
FY 1985-86

1. Specialist assistance was available to faculty for a wide variety of purposes, including consultants in the use of microcomputers or the selection and procurement of computer software and media specialists who helped faculty learn how to employ slides, audio tapes, video equipment, and other instructional media. Many campuses had consultants on teaching methods, curriculum development, student assessment, or advising. In some cases, this assistance included videotaping or observation of classes, and advice on grant proposals. Some campuses provided assistance to faculty in two special areas -- instruction for disabled students, and selected industrial technologies and processes.

2. Direct presentation of information took many forms, with one common approach being faculty workshops that treated such diverse topics as theories of learning, grant writing, instructional uses of computers and media, research methods, test construction and grading, development of new curriculum, academic program reviews, and orientation for new faculty, as well as topics of scholarly interest in the various disciplines. Lectures, conferences, symposia, and summer institutes covered teaching and learning styles, advising, and assessment, as well as research topics.

3. Grants to faculty were awarded both by CSU and by a wide variety of governmental and private sponsors of faculty research and scholarship. Non-CSU grants -- mostly for faculty research -- were administered by non-profit foundations created by the campuses for that purpose. CSU grants were awarded to support faculty research projects and pilot studies, including applied research (e.g., in agricultural technologies); projects aimed at improving instruction or curriculum; faculty retraining (e.g., from mathematics to computer science); and the preparation of proposals for outside funding of research projects.

4. Released, Assigned and reimbursed time are the CSU terms for released time for faculty. Resealed or assigned time is paid for from state-provided campus funds; reimbursed time is paid for from extramural (non-state) sources. Full-time CSU faculty generally teach twelve weighted units per term. On quarter-system campuses this is the equivalent of nine quarter courses per year, and on semester-system campuses the equivalent of eight semester courses. A faculty member with released, assigned or reimbursed time often taught one less course for one quarter; occasionally the course load reduction was greater and/or the period of assigned time longer. Some campuses granted a lighter course load to new faculty members, and other faculty obtained released, assigned or

reimbursed time in order to develop or refine curriculum, experiment with new approaches to instruction, develop research grant proposals, conduct research, retrain, or fulfill temporary duties.

5. Leaves -- sabbaticals, paid leaves, difference in pay leaves, and leaves and partial leaves without pay -- were provided to conduct research, take advantage of opportunities for internships or faculty exchanges, develop curriculum, or improve instructional skills. Leaves with full or partial pay were also a mechanism for supporting temporary faculty reassignments within CSU.

6. Awards were given that included summer stipends in support of grant proposal preparation or research, recognition of scholarly and creative activity, and awards for outstanding teaching or research. The latter categories include MPPP awards -- for meritorious performance and professional promise -- created as part of the CSU faculty collective bargaining agreement with the University, and supported by earmarked allocations from the Office of the Chancellor.

7. Travel funding was used to support attendance at professional conferences, though funds were often limited to the payment of travel costs and conference fees, and were rarely available unless the grantee was presenting a paper. Travel for retraining, summer institute attendance, and related purposes was also supported.

8. Education costs were paid (often only in part) for faculty who took courses, had off-campus internships, or field visits at other institutions. Faculty who took courses on their own campus usually had their course fees waived.

CSU System-Wide Programs, FY 1985-86

1. Direct services were provided in the form of conferences and institutes attended by selected faculty from throughout the system. For example, a "Teacher/Scholar" summer institute provided ten workshops over a five day period, to help faculty improve their skills in instruction, research, and writing. A Distinguished Artists Forum symposium brought CSU faculty and students together with outstanding artists in art, music, theatre, film and writing to share ideas and discuss ways to improve the teaching of the arts. An Arts Faculty Institute was also held to enhance the art and art training skills of CSU faculty. And the Chancellor's Office organized a systemwide conference to enhance the skills of CSU Education School graduates for teaching in multicultural settings.

2. Chancellor's Office funds allocated to campuses supported faculty retraining programs; curriculum innovation (e.g., a project to incorporate cross-cultural perspectives into the curriculum); selected instructional improvement projects; Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise (MPPP) awards for faculty achievement, and various other programs. Four new programs supported by the Chancellor's Office in 1986-87 were aimed at improving faculty computer skills.

3. Program support provided through the Office of the Chancellor also included CSU budget line items such as sabbaticals and affirmative action programs.

APPENDIX D

EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS AT CSU

A Teaching Center Created by Faculty

At Sonoma State University, faculty were instrumental in the creation of a Teaching Center that organized workshops and seminars on teaching and research topics; provides consulting advice to individual faculty on teaching, writing and publishing, and stress management; published a newsletter on teaching issues, including grant opportunities related to teaching improvement; and served as a campus resource for planning and implementing affirmative action policies. The Center grew out of faculty concerns that their jobs were becoming more complex and demanding, and that they needed help in teaching an increasingly heterogeneous student population. At a weekend retreat in fall 1985 the faculty decided to act on these concerns, and created a task force which contacted professional development experts and centers around the country and performed a faculty needs assessment. The task force -- which had more faculty volunteers than it could accommodate -- proposed creation of the Center, the campus president supported the idea, and the Center was started in fall 1986. It was staffed by a faculty member on released time, supported by a combination of campus funds from the faculty salary budget and "soft money" from extramural sources.

Sonoma State faculty -- like faculty on many other campuses -- felt under considerable stress in a system that from their perspective provided little or no support for professional development (e.g., travel funds, clerical help, working space, time for research or reflection, etc.). They nevertheless considered professional development a high priority, and created their own solution, albeit modest and limited. The Teaching Center was not perceived as a "remediation" device for faculty, but as a source of assistance. It was governed by the faculty governance committee, staffed by faculty and supported by the campus administration, and was responsive to faculty concerns. Its effect was limited by size and resource constraints, and it is too soon to know what its impact will be, but as a service created and "owned" by the faculty it is likely to be more successful than either more decentralized or more top down efforts that have not involved faculty from the outset.

A Systemic Approach to Professional Development

The Center for Faculty Development at CSU Long Beach has been supported by the system and campus for eleven years. Its director since 1985 has been a full-time professional development expert (formerly a professor of psychiatry and director of professional development at a large Eastern university), recruited to bring to the Long Beach campus a comprehensive, research-oriented approach to professional development. His associate director came to the campus at the same time from a psychiatry and behavioral sciences department at one of the UC campuses.

The Center devoted much of its time to three areas: improving teaching, helping faculty to be more productive in their research and writing, and improving the abilities of department chairs and other administrators to provide professional development. In addition, the Center from its inception provided two services rarely found in campus professional development programs: individual counseling on personal and professional problems such as writing blocks, speaking anxiety, depression, or alcoholism; and an intensive program of helping new faculty adjust to and succeed in their university careers. Other "targeted" programs are provided for middle-aged faculty who may have been burnt out, disillusioned, and unproductive; and for library faculty, to help them cope with pressures for publication and with other job pressures. The Center also offered a program aimed at facilitating faculty collegiality, and, in conjunction with the campus physical education department, offered fitness classes for all faculty.

Center programs employed a wide variety of means -- workshops, conferences, colloquia and seminars; support groups; individual counseling or coaching; a faculty mentoring program; self-help workbooks; classes; and publications. Assistance to faculty on teaching performance was usually based on direct classroom observation or videotaping, and assessment of student evaluations.

Much of the Center's work was based on empirical research conducted on campus, or on research that was conducted by the Director and others before he came to Long Beach. The program for new faculty, for example, included extensive interviews with new faculty, repeated each semester, to learn how they were coping with teaching, scholarship, professional identity and career satisfaction issues. In addition, one-third of new tenure-track faculty were observed weekly in various work settings -- classrooms, offices, laboratories/studios. The visits, supplemented by faculty record keeping, were used to monitor faculty coping skills, provide support, and offer interventions where help was requested. This and other research was documented in numerous journal articles and professional papers, and the Center worked actively to disseminate information on successful practices to other CSU campuses.

The CSULB Center was a rare attempt to institutionalize the professional development functions on a university campus. Full-time professionals with significant academic status were recruited to direct the Center, and they have concentrated on training academic administrators to provide professional development, and on delivering target services based on research that identified key areas of need. Rather than relying on the standard repertoire of grants, mini-grants, assigned time, etc. to promote professional development (though these programs were also available on campus), the Center assumed that professional development was an ongoing necessity, aimed at specific problems, and tried to involve faculty directly in finding solutions. Center efforts to document the effects of these efforts suggest that the program has been successful in helping faculty who participated. However, recent budget reductions have made it necessary for the Associate Director to leave, and the future of the Center is in some doubt.

APPENDIX E

COMMON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES AT CCC
FY 1985-86

1. The direct presentation of information made heavy use of workshops on a wide variety of topics, with emphasis on teaching strategies, course and curriculum planning, and student assessment. Workshops on computer skills and on the instructional uses of media were common, with many workshops organized around professional and technical discussions designed to help faculty stay current in their fields. Other means for presenting information were employed as well -- particularly lectures (e.g., guest lecturers on substantive topics to keep faculty abreast of current developments in various fields); seminars (e.g., on how to improve foreign language instruction, or teach writing skills); newsletters for faculty (with information on faculty development opportunities, faculty exchange programs, etc.); and department, division or college faculty retreats. These retreats sometimes included their own seminars and workshops, and often dealt with broad planning issues in curriculum and instruction. Workshops, seminars, and lectures (on campuses or at retreats) were often organized and presented by community college faculty themselves rather than by outside experts.

2. Leaves were most commonly sabbaticals -- offered in most districts -- though faculty occasionally also took leaves without pay. Sabbaticals were sometimes used for research (some instructors have written books during their leaves), and often supported scholarly activities designed to keep faculty current in their fields or retrain them in new disciplines. Many faculty redesigned courses during their leave time.

3. Travel funding supported faculty attendance at off-campus workshops, conferences and seminars designed to help them maintain subject-area currency (e.g., conferences for vocational faculty that reviewed recent trends in industry) or learn how to improve teaching.

4. Specialist assistance was provided on many campuses by faculty computer or media experts, who consulted with or trained faculty in the instructional uses of these tools. Selected administrators or faculty also provided assistance to their colleagues in preparing grant proposals, and outside consultants were sometimes hired to teach faculty how to use equipment purchased by or donated to a college. Many colleges had industry advisory groups that helped to keep college vocational faculty up to date on recent technologies or processes.

5. Courses were sometimes organized by members of the faculty to provide information to their colleagues that could not be covered

during one or two workshops (e.g., on vocational topics; or a course profiling hispanic students, to increase cultural awareness among the faculty).

6. Released time was often available for faculty who organized and delivered the above courses, workshops, seminars, or lectures. Released time was also available for faculty working on course revisions or new instructional approaches.

7. Grants were available in very limited numbers at many districts for projects leading to curriculum development, instructional improvement, or professional growth.

8. Peer assistance was occasionally present in the form of mentorships that paired new and experienced faculty.

9. Payment of education costs was common for faculty who enrolled in courses at four-year institutions in order to learn more about their fields.

10. Support for faculty exposure to new information included support for faculty time spent teaching abroad (e.g., by granting leaves of absence), and often took the form of faculty exchanges within the system.

11. Support for faculty collegial communication included the organization of teleconferences to help faculty keep abreast of colleagues' work and stay current in their fields; support for faculty membership in professional organizations and college membership in national staff and organizational development groups; and regional faculty development networks that shared information about events, programs, speakers, and research among faculty development coordinators at member colleges.

12. Flexible calendar programs enabled community colleges to reduce the length of their academic year by up to fifteen (out of 175) days if faculty were engaged in development activities during that time. Twelve single-college districts participated in this program in FY 1985-86 (though usually for less than the full fifteen days allowed); their flexible calendar programs provided a wide variety of workshops and lectures for faculty on topics ranging from computer techniques, teaching methods, and academic subjects, to stress management, interpersonal relations, or how to run effective meetings.

CCC System-Wide Programs, FY 1985-86

Two programs established by the state legislature and administered by the Office of the Chancellor supported faculty development throughout the system.

1. The Fund for Instructional Improvement (FII) was created in 1977 to provide grants and loans to faculty who seek to develop, test, and implement alternative educational programs. The program awards grants or loans on a competitive basis for projects lasting up to one year, with applicant districts required to support at least ten percent of project costs through matching funds (a requirement usually satisfied by counting district indirect costs rather than paying cash). The Chancellor's Office reports that the great majority of projects would have been broadly defined as faculty development.

2. The Vocational-Technology Instructor and Career Counselor In-Service Training Project awarded grants on a competitive basis to vocational faculty who sought support for upgrading their knowledge and skills through work-site experience in business and industry. Most of the funding went toward the support of faculty release time and sabbatical leaves; the program did not directly support projects aimed at improving teaching skills or developing curriculum, though it was expected to lead to curriculum and teaching improvements as faculty maintained and increased their currency in these fields.

In addition to programs administered by the Office of the Chancellor --

3. Some programs available to faculty from all colleges were sponsored by state-wide organizations and funded by the districts. The California Association of Community Colleges (CACC) and the Statewide Academic Senate, for example, jointly sponsored a Great Teachers Seminar attended by about sixty faculty members from around the state. The Seminar consisted of a series of discussions over a period of five or six days, in which participants shared ideas, information, and problems encountered in teaching. The CACC reports that more than twenty colleges have now also developed their own versions of this yearly seminar for their faculties.

APPENDIX F

AN EXEMPLARY PROGRAM AT CCC

Faculty development at the community colleges often consisted of isolated activities that were not part of a comprehensive plan for the improvement of instruction or curriculum. Some colleges were exceptions; Los Medanos College, in the Contra Costa Community College District, provided one example of a different approach.[2]

Los Medanos is a small college that offered a familiar panoply of faculty development programs: Sabbaticals, workshops, campus seminars and conferences, grants to faculty, support for faculty travel. A faculty member on one-third release time acted as faculty development coordinator. The planning for these programs involved faculty, administrators and staff in regular meetings that reviewed campus programmatic needs, assessed faculty strengths and weaknesses, and attempt to develop an integrated menu of faculty development activities that were complementary and mutually reinforcing.

One program that emerged from these planning meetings was called NEXUS -- a year-long program to orient and socialize new faculty members. The program put new and experienced faculty together as a group to discuss teaching strategies and innovations, classroom management techniques, and campus practices. The program was widely supported by new and established faculty, both of whom reported that they valued the opportunity to establish collegial and supportive relationships -- as a source of much needed information for new faculty, and of renewal for their established colleagues.

Los Medanos participated in the flexible calendar program, allocating nine days per year to intensive faculty development workshops, lectures, and similar activities, usually organized around one major topic. (The most recent topic was student learning styles and how to respond in the classroom to student learning differences.) Where it fit into the overall objectives of the program, faculty also used some of their time during flexible calendar days to participate in development activities off campus -- such as observing an industrial process, or working on an interdisciplinary project with faculty from other colleges.

---

[2] A number of other community colleges support significant faculty development efforts, but study resource constraints made it impossible to visit those campuses. Los Medanos is one laudable example, but it is by no means unique.

Los Medanos administrators did not report complete success for these efforts; they described as a "constant struggle" the effort to break through from one-time workshops to a comprehensive program of faculty development. What distinguished the college's programs from those found on many other campuses was the self-conscious effort to integrate faculty development into the fabric of professional activities on campus, and to do so by involving faculty and administrators in joint planning that began by considering program goals and faculty needs.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of January 1988, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Mim Andelson, Los Angeles
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach, *Chairperson*
Henry Der, San Francisco
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles, *Vice Chairperson*
Sharon N. Skog, Palo Alto
Thomas E. Stang, Los Angeles
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; appointed by the Regents of the University of California

Claudia H. Hampton, Los Angeles; appointed by the Trustees of the California State University

Borgny Baird, Long Beach; appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; appointed by the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Kenneth L. Peters, Tarzana; appointed by the California State Board of Education

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obispo; appointed by California's independent colleges and universities

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including Community Colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other state agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning,

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to address the Commission may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of a meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, William H. Pickens, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 40 to 50 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514; telephone (916) 445-7933.

EXPLORING FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION: VOLUME TWO

California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 88-19

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include:

88-6 Comments on Educational Equity Plans of the Segments: A Staff Report on the Development of Plans by the State Department of Education, the California State University, and the University of California to Achieve the Educational Equity Goals of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 83 (1984) (February 1988)

88-7 Size, Growth, and Cost of Administration at the California State University: A Report Prepared by Price Waterhouse and MGT Consultants for the California Postsecondary Education Commission (February 1988)

88-8 Overview of the 1988-89 Governor's Budget for Postsecondary Education in California: Testimony by William H. Pickens, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1988)

88-9 Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1988-89: The Commission's 1987 Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) (March 1988)

88-10 Eligibility of California's 1986 High School Graduates for Admission to Its Public Universities: A Report of the 1986 High School Eligibility Study (March 1988)

88-11 Eligibility for Freshman Admission to the University of California: A Statement to the Regents of the University by William H. Pickens, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission, February 18, 1988 (March 1988)

88-12 Time to Degree in California's Public Universities: Factors Contributing to the Length of Time Undergraduates Take to Earn Their Bachelor's Degree (March 1988)

88-13 Evaluation of the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP): A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 2398 (Chapter 620, Statutes of 1984) (March 1988)

88-14 Standardized Tests Used for Higher Education Admission and Placement in California During 1987: The Third in a Series of Annual Reports Published in Accordance with Senate Bill 1758 (Chapter 1505, Statutes of 1984) (March 1988)

88-15 Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics Fall 1987: University of California, The California State University, and California's Independent Colleges and Universities (March 1988)

88-16 Legislative Update, March 1988: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1988)

88-17 State Policy for Faculty Development in California Public Higher Education: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1986 Budget Act (May 1988)

88-18 to 20 Exploring Faculty Development in California Higher Education: Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission by Berman, Weiler Associates:

- **88-18** Volume One: Executive Summary and Conclusions, by Paul Berman and Daniel Weiler, December 1987 (March 1988)
- **88-19** Volume Two: Findings, by Paul Berman, Jo-Ann Intili and Daniel Weiler, December 1987 (March 1988)
- **88-20** Volume Three: Appendix, by Paul Berman, Jo-Ann Intili, and Daniel Weiler, January 1988 (March 1988)

88-21 Staff Development in California's Public Schools: Recommendations of the Policy Development Committee for the California Staff Development Policy Study, March 16, 1988 (March 1988)

88-22 and 23 Staff Development in California: Public and Personal Investments, Program Patterns, and Policy Choices, by Judith Warren Little, William H. Gerritz, David S. Stern, James W. Guthrie, Michael W. Kirst, and David D. Marsh. A Joint Publication of Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development • Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), December 1987:

- **88-22** Executive Summary (March 1988)
- **88-23** Report (March 1988)